

### Copyright Warning:

The work from which this copy was made did not include a formal copyright notice. Nonetheless, this work may be protected by copyright law.

Further reproduction of this copy *may* be allowed:

- With permission from the rights-holder;
- Or if the copyright on the work has expired;
- Or if the use is "fair use";
- Or within another exemption under the U.S. copyright law.

The user of this work is responsible for determining lawful uses.

THE HOLY SACRIFICE

The Biblical Basis for a  
Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice

A Dissertation  
submitted to the Dean and Faculty  
of the Episcopal Theological School  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the Degree of  
Bachelor of Divinity

by

Frederick A. Fenton

May 1961

Having with us Him that pleads above,  
We here present, we here spread forth to Thee,  
That only offering perfect in Thine eyes,  
The one true pure immortal sacrifice.

## CONTENTS

Chapter	page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. WHY A THEOLOGY OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE IS NOT ELABORATED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	5
A. Statement of the Problem (5)	
B. Sacrifice in the Old Testament (8)	
C. Sacrifice in the New Testament (28)	
III. THE NEW TESTAMENT BASIS FOR A DOCTRINE OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE	68
A. The Last Supper (68)	
B. The Eternal Sacrifice (73)	
C. The Body of Christ (82)	
IV. CONCLUSION	99
A. A View from Early Tradition (99)	
B. The Reformation Deadlock (104)	
C. The Eucharistic Sacrifice (110)	

Bibliography

Critique by C.W.F. Smith

## Chapter I.

### INTRODUCTION

Scripture versus Tradition (or alternately, Tradition versus Scripture) is a false antithesis. Commitment to this truth, as the history of Anglicanism shows, is a hard thing to maintain. Some scholars fall back into a false distinction between Revelation and reason, between the Gospel and the historic Creeds. Others refuse to see any distinction at all, preferring to stand on the 'Via Media' -- a slogan which, like most slogans, effectively conceals whatever truth may lie behind it! Still others prefer to blur all distinctions. With some justice, J.S. Whale has described Anglicanism as "a heartfelt appeal for ambiguity."<sup>1</sup>

It is simply not enough to declare that Scripture and Tradition both witness to the same truth. Such a commitment should issue in a vigorous attempt to state in contemporary terms just what that truth is. Ambiguity is only a virtue when it is unavoidable, that is to say, when the truth itself is ambiguous.

The dissertation which follows is not, however, an essay in systematic theology. It is, rather, the

necessary first step to such an undertaking: a survey of the Biblical and Traditional basis for a doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice. If it concerns itself almost exclusively with the Biblical material and relegates the study of Tradition to the Conclusion, that is not because the historical development of the doctrine is considered unimportant. It has been, in fact, of the greatest significance. Rather, it is because the Biblical basis for that development has been given such inadequate treatment. There is truth in Henry VIII's laconic dictum "Most all heretics rest on scripture,"<sup>2</sup> but with regard to the Eucharist we are more in need of Walter Lowrie's salty remark that "To affirm bluntly that it is a sacrifice may not be much wiser than to deny it."<sup>3</sup> What is the relation of eucharistic sacrifice to the Gospel of Jesus Christ as set forth on the pages of the New Testament? That is the question the following pages will attempt to explore.

There is another reason why Tradition is not given a fuller treatment in this study. A short time wrestling with the problem of the New Testament's silence about eucharistic sacrifice revealed the necessity of a detailed study of Old Testament origins of sacrifice. The majority of the time available to me for

preparing the thesis which follows was thus spent analyzing the various riddles presented by the Biblical evidence. It has been a fascinating undertaking, but it has not left time for adequate consideration of the later material -- which, indeed, provides more than enough scope for a study devoted to it alone.

The conviction which prompted this undertaking is that sacrifice is central to the Christian message. A year's study has only confirmed my belief that this is so. To deny the importance of sacrifice for a doctrine of the Atonement or Eucharistic theology on the basis of the fact that animal sacrifice is repugnant to modern man, is like not teaching the Resurrection because the average person today is more Greek than Hebrew in his thinking about life after death. If the finest expression of sacrifice that we know is the eternal self-giving love of Christ revealed at Calvary, then the idea of sacrifice puts us in touch with the heart of the Gospel message. Of no less central significance for those who would join their love and service with His matchless gift, is the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice.

Notes for Chapter I.

<sup>1</sup>J.S. Whale, Victor and Victim (Cambridge: The University Press, 1960), 54.

<sup>2</sup>Henry VIII, Assertio Septem Sacramentorum (Paris: Desboys Ed., 1562), 79b.

<sup>3</sup>Walter Lowrie, Action in the Liturgy (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953), 15.



## Chapter II.

### WHY A THEOLOGY OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE IS NOT ELABORATED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

#### A.

#### Statement of the Problem

The New Testament does not refer to the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice, nor does it contain a discussion of the relation of Christ's sacrifice to the sacrament of his Body and Blood.<sup>1</sup> In contrast to this, the Fathers of the ancient Church universally speak of the Eucharist as a sacrifice.<sup>2</sup> The apparent conflict between these two views has generally been resolved by an appeal to authority. Protestant biblicists have attacked and Catholic traditionalists defended a doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice simply on the basis of traditional submission to the dictates of Holy Writ or Holy Church.<sup>3</sup> As a result, there has been very little critical investigation of the evidence for such a doctrine in the New Testament or Patristic material itself.

Nor has the situation been much improved by recent attempts to reconcile the disputant parties by means of a return to the 'true' meaning of sacrifice. The conclusion of Old Testament scholars that sacrifice originally concerns the bestowal of life rather than the

death of a victim<sup>4</sup> has been used all too often merely as a basis for reaching ecumenical agreement rather than a hypothesis for further testing of the biblical material itself. The result is an ever-increasing number of theological studies of the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice, but comparatively little discussion of the silence of the New Testament on the subject.

The present study begins with such a discussion. The claim here made is that the New Testament contains an implicit view of eucharistic sacrifice. If this be true, the question naturally arises as to why such development did not occur within the period of the New Testament itself - why, in other words, a theology of eucharistic sacrifice is not elaborated in the canonical writings of the first Christian century.

Two kinds of evidence can be offered. First, there are many reasons why individual writings do not treat the death of Christ in relation to the Eucharist. Vincent Taylor's study, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching, provides, for the most part, an excellent analysis of the New Testament material from this perspective,<sup>5</sup> and it will be referred to frequently in the following pages. Second, there is at least the possibility of discovering some reasons common to all the New Testament writers for their failure to develop a doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice.

In spite of its obvious importance for a biblical understanding of the subject, this second type of evidence usually has been ignored. It is not a crux to scholars who suppose they can find a doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice stated in the writings of St. Paul or some other New Testament author,<sup>6</sup> and it is far too conjectural for those who, content with the apparent conflict between New Testament and Patristic teaching on the subject, are not disposed to search out stumbling blocks to their own theological positions.

However, it will be argued here that fundamental influences do underlie the sacrificial teaching of the various New Testament writings, and that these influences best account for the New Testament's lack of direct teaching on the theme of eucharistic sacrifice. It further will be argued that this provides evidence for the claim that the paucity of New Testament teaching about the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharistic results from the historical situation in which that literature was produced, rather than insuperable theological objections to such a doctrine within the primitive Christian communities. Indeed, Chapter III will endeavor to show that there is in the writings of the New Testament an implied view of eucharistic sacrifice upon the basis of which a thoroughly biblical doctrine can be erected.

However, before such a demonstration can be attempted, it will be necessary to present in the following two sections of this chapter the Old Testament view of sacrifice and an interpretation of its significance with regard to the silence of the New Testament authors on the subject of eucharistic sacrifice.

#### B. Sacrifice in the Old Testament

If the common error of Medieval eucharistic theology and Reformation polemic alike is the idea that sacrifice is simply equivalent to death,<sup>7</sup> the mistake of our own time appears to be just the opposite: scholars now assert that the sacrificial blood represents life and proceed to so interpret its signification throughout the biblical record.<sup>8</sup> To say this is not to deny that within the matrix of Old Testament concepts blood often represents the seat of life and sacrifice consists of liberating this life and offering it to the deity. That much has been well established.<sup>9</sup> It is, rather, to assert that such ideas have lost their power in the New Testament period and if present at all are merely residual and not vital to the thought of passages in which they appear.

When, for instance, St. Paul refers to the 'blood

of Christ' (αἵμα), as in Colossians 1:20 where he says that mankind has been reconciled "by the blood of his cross," the expression is to be understood simply as a synonym for Christ's death. It may be that Paul is thinking of the Jewish idea of blood sacrifice for sin, but if so he intends no elaborate analogy based upon the Levitical precept that 'the blood is the life.'<sup>10</sup> The decisive argument against those who would introduce the psychology of the ancient temple cultus to explain the meaning of blood in this context, is that such ideas were simply not important to the popular interpretation of sacrifice in New Testament times. St. Paul himself nowhere speaks of Christ's death in terms of the sacrificial offering up of life, and when, as we shall see, the author of Hebrews makes detailed comparison between Christ's sacrifice and temple rites, his meaning is altogether different from the Levitical concept.<sup>12</sup> The reason for this, and the major explanation for the absence of an explicit doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice within the New Testament, is dominance of the postexilic attitude toward sacrifice in the cultic tradition of the New Testament period.

In order to understand this postexilic attitude and to correctly assess its strength in the New

Testament period - as well as to establish a basis for discussion of the meaning of sacrifice in the New Testament and beyond - it is necessary to have some idea of the background of ancient Israelite views of sacrifice out of which it developed. The forced sojourn of the Jewish people in foreign lands during the sixth century B.C. brought the time of Israel's national cultus and institutions to an end, but the legacy from the past was revised rather than rewritten during the interim period, and the community which was restored after the exile owed at least as much to the past as it did to more recent events in its history.<sup>13</sup>

The actual origin of sacrifice is lost in the primordial history of mankind. It witnessed to a basic human need, described by E.O. James as "a natural desire on the part of man to establish a bond between himself and that which he conceived to be sacred."<sup>14</sup> It does not suit our purpose to enter into the debate as to which element was primary in primitive man's understanding of how this bond was to be achieved. Did he first conceive of sacrifice as a gift to the deity,<sup>15</sup> a communion with him,<sup>16</sup> or release of the mysterious life-force in the blood?<sup>17</sup> Most scholars agree that these three elements really cannot be separated from each other, that each had its part in shaping the chief institution of ancient religion.<sup>18</sup>

Certainly this was true for Israel.<sup>19</sup> W.O.E. Oesterley, in his careful study of Sacrifices in Ancient Israel, has shown that the three basis purposes of primitive sacrifice were present in each major period of Old Testament history.<sup>20</sup> And yet the real function of the cultus in the life of Israel is by no means revealed by simply listing the basic elements it shared in common with the sacrifices of other semitic cultures. The Jewish people were inheritors of a unique religious tradition, and their attitude toward sacrifice was not left unaffected by it.

At first it seems unlikely that this could be so. The Old Testament records an incredible range of individual and communal offerings, and the details of its sacrificial legislation belie a higher motivation.<sup>21</sup> Moreover, an understanding of the meaning of the cultus in Israel seems to be obscured by the fact that only in one place<sup>22</sup> is allusion made to the modus operandi of sacrifice. But such explanations are of little significance for a revealed religion,<sup>23</sup> and the unique place sacrifice could occupy within the religion of Yahweh came not from the primitive rationale behind sacrifice itself but the basic tenets of the Jewish faith.

There is thus no essential contrast to be drawn between Canaanite and native Jewish worship as such. The

institution of sacrifice was very nearly the same in each. This is not to say that sacrifice was something added on to the religion of Israel after the settlement in Canaan. The oldest rule of sacrifice may be the regulation of first-fruits offerings in Exodus 22:30, which shows that the practice goes back to the nomadic stage in Israel's history.<sup>24</sup> Nor is it meant to imply that there was any essential conflict between the distinctive Old Testament point of view and the religion of sacrifice. We shall see that the latter was gradually placed in a new context and given an added meaning by those who were advocates of the Biblical understanding. It is, rather, to emphasize what has been said above, that sacrifice was a common inheritance of both the religion of Yahweh and the other religions of the ancient Near-Eastern world, and that if we are to discover its continuing significance in the religion of Israel we must look at that religion through the eyes of the creative minority who have given us the canonical Old Testament.

The fundamental assertion made by these authors is that Yahweh is a god who has chosen to reveal himself in history. The importance of this can hardly be overstated. That which sets Old Testament religion apart from the polytheistic fertility cults of Canaan, with their deification of the forces in nature upon which man is



dependent, is its interpretation of reality primarily in terms of events in the ongoing history of the Jewish people.<sup>25</sup> Sacrifice was already a given factor by the time these conflicting world views emerged, but the unique Israelite emphasis upon history issued in a quite different understanding of the role and meaning of the cultus. We cannot review in detail the process by which this occurred, but we can note the major points of influence in the pre-exilic period and thus prepare the way for a discussion of developments after the exile and their importance for understanding the New Testament.

The Old Testament presents the history of the Jewish people, from their exodus out of slavery onwards, as the history of Yahweh's mighty acts of deliverance. From ancient times, from the days of the Patriarchs themselves,<sup>26</sup> he has revealed himself to them as a personal god who enters into a berith, a covenant relationship with them. In the time of their creation as a nation under Yahweh, the high historic moment at Sinai,<sup>27</sup> the covenant is expressed in the sprinkling of the sacrificial blood on altar and people (Ex. 24:5-11). It is not a sacrifice made to propitiate an angry deity, nor intended as nourishment for the mysterious powers lurking behind the forces in nature, but as an expression of the divine chesed, the living-kindness of God - shown

forth in the establishing of a covenant relation between himself and his people.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, the cultus was to continue throughout the Old Testament period as a means of grace for the renewal of that relationship established with Yahweh at a given point in the nation's history. In this way sacrifice was set within the context of a people's understanding of its special vocation. It became an inextricable part of the meaning that Israel found in history.<sup>29</sup>

The cult is not something man does for God, so that God may profit by it, nor is it performed in order to obtain something from God, so that man may get something out of it, for in Israel God is good to His people. In Israel the cult exists in order to maintain and purify the communion between man and God (for fundamentally the relation between God and man is good): the cult exists as a means to integrate the communion between God and man which God has instituted in His Covenant, in other words, the cult exists for the sake of atonement (this word taken in a general sense of 'reconciliation').<sup>30</sup>

This emphasis on the divine initiative in establishing the covenantal relation between man and God is important to remember when we come to a discussion of the significance of atonement sacrifices in the post-exilic period. Man strives to obey the ordinances of the covenant law, but human sin and ignorance create barriers between himself and God. These barriers are removed only by God's generous acceptance of the offerings that man brings.<sup>31</sup>

When sacrifice was offered for the expiation of sin, the Law asked for more than ritual acts alone:

And the Lord said to Moses, "Say to the people of Israel, When a man or woman commits any of the sins that men commit by breaking faith with the Lord, and that person is guilty, he shall confess his sin which he has committed; and he shall make full restitution for his wrong... in addition to the ram of atonement with which atonement is made for him."<sup>32</sup>

To the solemn word of the Law on this matter was added the eloquent protests of the Prophets. Prophetic criticism of the cultus for its frequent failure to emphasize repentance is so familiar that it requires no illustration here.<sup>33</sup> However, there was and still is a great deal of misunderstanding with regard to the proper interpretation of the prophetic protest. Was it intended to bring about the abrogation of sacrifice? That was the belief of the Liberal Protestant school of the late 19th century - when men were fascinated by the idea of progress. Scholars contrasted the advanced ethical teaching of the prophets on the one hand, with the heathen institution of sacrifice on the other. Thus Wellhausen wrote in 1885:

If the Priestly Code makes the cultus the principal thing, that appears to amount to a systematic decline into the heathenism which the prophets incessantly combated and yet were unable to eradicate.<sup>34</sup>

It may be doubted if this can any longer be said fairly to represent the facts in the matter. An historically grounded approach to the records of the past reveals the fact that sacrifice was an established and universally accepted necessity throughout the ancient Near-Eastern world. The prophets denounce abuses in the system, but in so doing they do not intend to disassociate themselves from the cultus. This is the view of an increasing number of scholars today.<sup>35</sup> It is based on a wide variety of considerations with which we cannot here deal, but the heart of the matter is perhaps best expressed by H.H. Rowley in this passage from his detailed treatment of the whole subject in The Unity of the Bible,<sup>36</sup> published in 1953:

Viewing all these passages together, the attitude of the pre-exilic prophets would appear to have been that sacrifice as an external act unrelated to the spirit had no value, and was positively dishonouring to God. It was a vain effort to deceive him, appearing to express a meaning by the act but not really charging the act with the meaning. It was by obedience that the real attitude of the heart was expressed, and if there had been some lapse for which pardon was sought by the sacrifice, then there must be some true repentance in the heart, or the sin would be clung to in the heart and God mocked by the cry for pardon... The pre-exilic prophets denounced sacrifices which were hollow and ineffective; but there is no reason to suppose that they held that no other sacrifices could be offered by men whose hearts were right with

God... It was not the act alone that mattered, but the act as charged with the spirit of the worshipper. It was in the Temple that Isaiah had his call, and in the moment of that experience he felt his lips touched with a live coal from the altar and his whole being was purified by its touch. It cannot be that he thought it wrong to tread the Temple courts, or supposed the altar to be a thing evil in itself.<sup>37</sup>

We may review what has been said thus far by emphasizing that the unique role of sacrifice in Israel in the pre-exilic period is to be explained on the basis of the general Old Testament witness to the meaning and purpose of history. The key to this meaning and purpose is the realization that God makes his will known in the events of history itself. Thus Israelite sacrifice is regarded as a divinely ordained means of maintaining a covenant relationship between God and his people - a relationship God himself, in his goodness and mercy, has established. The Law and the Prophets emphasize that cultic observances without repentance are valueless, but for each sacrifice forms an integral part of the obedience that man owes to God under this Covenant.

Many and varied are the sacrifices which are bought, and it should be remembered that not all of them are related to the expiation of sin. Indeed, the sacrifices of the pre-exilic period were commonly individual

offerings<sup>38</sup> with a wide range of intention. There were first-fruit offerings and animal offerings the dominant note of which was thanksgiving, and there was the peace offering with its common meal and its note of praise and gladness (as part of the Passover, it served as a commemoration of deliverance from state slavery in Egypt<sup>39</sup>).

The Kingdom period brought a national cultus into being, and it was probably at this time that the practice of a daily burnt offering on behalf of the community began.<sup>40</sup> The reforms of Josiah brought the rigid centralization of the cultus at Jerusalem and a loss of popular participation in the sacrifices, but it is almost certain that in the period following his death the altars were rebuilt at the ancient shrines.<sup>41</sup>

Whatever may be the ultimate decision of the anthropologists as to the original meaning of sacrifice, Old Testament scholars are agreed that when the developed Israelite cultus comes into being the dominant idea is that of offering a gift to the deity.<sup>42</sup> The manipulation of blood rather than the slaying of a victim is the prominent feature of the animal sacrifices, and the mysteriously potent blood when released by death is offered to God or used as a means of consecration.<sup>43</sup> But the whole system is subsumed under the covenant

revelation of Yahweh's good will and intention toward his people.

The destruction of Jerusalem by the armies of Nebuchadrezzar in 587 B.C. represents a real turning point in Israel's development. "At a stroke her national existence was ended and, with it, all the institutions in which her corporate life had expressed itself."<sup>44</sup> The exile which followed strongly influenced the whole subsequent history of the Jewish people. No longer a national-cultic community, the Jews of the exilic period maintained their identity by a strict adherence to tradition and law. Two things prompted them in this direction. First, the prophets before and during the exile explained the national disaster as a divine judgement for the breach of covenant law. Second, nation and cult having vanished, there was little else to mark them as Jews. Both factors influenced the postexilic view of sacrifice. The prophetic teaching gave Israel a much broader vision of God's ultimate rule in the world and a new awareness of the sin that had forestalled that universal triumph. The second factor, the need for preserving a sense of community by loyalty to covenant and tradition, produced a new rigorism with regard to the demands of the law (particularly the ceremonial law).<sup>45</sup>

Consonant with this deeper awareness of corporate and individual sin and the requirement of greater obedience to the law, the whole temple cult in the postexilic period centers around the need for atonement.<sup>46</sup> Although their origin probably lay deep in Israel's past,<sup>47</sup> it was in this period that the piacular sacrifices, the sin- and guilt- offerings with their culmination in the Day of Atonement ceremonies, found their full expression and development.

Two special questions with regard to the fully developed postexilic sacrificial system must be discussed. First, were the atonement sacrifices primarily viewed as propitiatory and substitutionary, or were they predominantly expiatory? Second, were they effective for all classes of sins, or were there some transgressions that were beyond their reach?

Neither of these questions can be finally answered on the basis of the Old Testament. Scholars have disagreed as to the proper interpretation of the evidence.<sup>48</sup> However, certain observations can at least give some much-needed perspective on the issues involved. For instance, against the view that "the removal of Yahweh's displeasure was probably always one of the objects of the sacrifice"<sup>49</sup> it is important to stress what has been said above with regard to the Old Testament understanding



of the institution of sacrifice as the expression of God's love and prevenient grace.<sup>50</sup> G. Ernest Wright has emphasized this point as follows:

The sacrificial cultus in its deepest meaning was not a provision for divine needs or wants to the end that a favor be wrested from a God whose attention the gift had secured. It was instead a revelation, a gift of God himself, a means which he provided whereby he might be worshipped.<sup>51</sup>

N.K. Gottwald has perhaps captured something of the feeling that lay behind this unique point of view.

The whole apparatus of worship and sacrifice is a gift of grace, a channel for unclean man to approach a holy God. Atonement is a divine provision. Motivating and suffusing the legal stipulations is a spirit of the numinous. The Holy One condescends to reveal an order of life by which his people may approach him.<sup>52</sup>

If such an imaginative reconstruction is at all accurate, it is difficult to see how propitiation in the sense of appeasing God's wrath for sin could have been a dominant note in the mature Old Testament theology behind sacrifice. The meaning behind the Hebrew verb kipper, which is translated "to make atonement," is probably better conveyed by the idea of expiation, in the sense of "covering" or "blotting out" the sin, with the attached idea of restoration to God's favor.<sup>53</sup>

C.R. North states in his article on "Sacrifice" in A Theological Word Book of the Bible that "To-day it is

generally agreed that the idea of substitution, even if it is present at all in O.T. sacrifice, is by no means prominent."<sup>54</sup> The idea that in sacrifice an animal victim was substituted for the sinner, and its death accepted by God as a satisfaction for the sin, may have come principally from a misunderstanding of the scapegoat ceremonial of the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16:21).<sup>55</sup> The laying on of hands in this connection undoubtedly signifies the transferring of sin, but when this has been done, when the priest has put his hands on the goat's head and confessed "all the iniquities of the people of Israel, and all of their transgressions," the scapegoat is led into the wilderness. It is not sacrificed. Atonement had been made for the sins of the people by sprinkling of blood upon the Mercy Seat (verse 17) before the scapegoat entered on his part of the ceremony. Only an animal regarded as sinless was fit to be offered as a sacrifice. The normal practice of the worshipper placing his hand upon the animal to be sacrificed is to be interpreted as meaning that he was to be identified with his offering, not that the offering would be a vicarious substitute for himself.<sup>56</sup>

The second question is more difficult to deal with than the first. Were the sacrifices effective for all of the sins of the people, or were there some transgressions

for which atonement was not possible? Here it is necessary to set aside the well-known pronouncement of the author of Hebrews on the subject,<sup>57</sup> and to divest oneself of any view of the matter dictated in advance of the evidence by some theory of the work of Christ. Objectivity will not produce a final conclusion from insufficient evidence, but it will perhaps make judgements more reliable.

Sins, under the system of the Jewish law, were distinguished as sins committed beyad ramah "with a high hand," and sins of a less serious kind, such as those of inadvertance, bishegagah. The former had no atonement by sacrifice (Num. 15:22-31; I Sam. 3:14). However, the law was not without ambiguity on this point. Expiation was available for some sins which were perfectly conscious and voluntary (Lev. 19:20-22; Num. 5:5-8). The difficulty of applying the distinction which the law clearly intended is perhaps best illustrated by an attempt to formulate an inclusive definition of sins capable of being redeemed:

They comprehended all sins done not in a spirit of rebellion against the law or ordinance of Jehovah, sins committed through human imperfection, or human ignorance, or human passion; sins done when the mind was directed to some end connected with human weakness or selfishness, but not formally opposed to the authority of the Lawgiver.<sup>58</sup>

On the basis of this it seems at least likely that there may have been some confusion on this subject in the popular mind.

Ezekiel emphasizes that one who commits deliberate or presumptuous sin can only be forgiven by the unmerited grace of God, beyond all reason or expectation,<sup>59</sup> but we must put this teaching beside the common belief that chesed expresses the motive for God's pardon. "In Israel," writes Edmond Jacob, "faith in the love and faithfulness of Yahweh was so great that the possibility of pardon was never doubted."<sup>60</sup> Weighing the dictates of the law on the one hand, and the prophetic insistence upon repentance<sup>u</sup> on the other, Frederick C. Grant concludes:

The problem of "unforgivable" sin, which rarely arose, was much the same as in the New Testament: it was "unforgivable" largely because, as a matter of fact, the sinner did not, and presumably could not repent.<sup>61</sup>

It is therefore difficult to accept the following statement by C.F.D. Moule, in his study of The Sacrifice of Christ:

The very fact that sacrifices were constantly repeated bore witness to their inability to be finally efficacious: the repetition of sacrifice is its own indictment.<sup>62</sup>

Levitical sacrifices."<sup>91</sup> Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that for the author of Hebrews Christ's sacrifice was His perfect obedience, both in life and in death.<sup>92</sup>

It seems hard to avoid the conclusion that in the New Testament "the blood of Christ," rather than referring to the life outpoured in sacrificial libation before the Father,"<sup>93</sup> actually signifies the death which was the supreme revelation of Christ's offering of complete obedience to the will of God. Whereas the former truth might have been immediately assimilated to eucharistic theology, the latter obscured in the New Testament period the relation between the oblation of the Cross and the eucharistic oblation.<sup>94</sup>

2.  
Emphasis upon the inadequacy of  
sacrifice under the old covenant  
and the once-for-all character  
of the sacrifice of Christ

These closely associated ideas have been a notorious stumbling block to those who would forward a doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice. The undeniable emphasis that the New Testament places upon both the inadequacy of the old means of grace<sup>95</sup> and the once-for-all character of the sacrifice of Christ<sup>96</sup> also checked the development of such a doctrine in the first Christian century. However, a right understanding of the truth that each of

these teachings conveys, as well as the problems of the period in which it was deemed necessary to give them special emphasis, removes a number of doubts about the patristic doctrine of eucharistic oblation.

In the section on sacrifice in the Old Testament, the question was raised as to whether the matter of "unforgivable sins" was ever a live issue for Israel.<sup>97</sup> If Grant is right in saying that the problem "rarely arose,"<sup>98</sup> then presumably the "inadequacy" of sacrifice ought never to have come to the fore. However, the New Testament authors thought of the sacrifices of the Old Covenant as being "inadequate" in a quite different sense. Whether or not the Levitical sacrifices were viewed in any period as genuinely efficacious for sins of a serious nature, they were demonstrably unable to overcome the sinfulness of man, that is to say, they could not be finally efficacious. It may be doubted that this was a problem for the average Jew of New Testament times. For St. Paul it was a severe problem, although he viewed it in terms of the insufficiency of the Law rather than the impotence of the cultus. When Paul experienced reconciliation through the salvation brought by Christ, it was for him much more than forgiveness of sins. It was deliverance from the fallen state that man had inherited from the disobedience of Adam, freedom from

the evil impulses of human nature, and victory over the hostile powers of the universe!<sup>99</sup> "Concerning forgiveness he (Paul) has very little to say, and he never represents it as the object for which Christ died."<sup>100</sup>

Let us now look at the famous passage from Hebrews.

For since the law has but a shadow of the good things to come instead of the true form of these realities, it can never, by the same sacrifices which are continually offered year after year, make perfect those who draw near. Otherwise, would they not have ceased to be offered? If the worshipers had once been cleansed, they would no longer have any consciousness of sin. But in these sacrifices there is a reminder of sin year after year. For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins.<sup>101</sup>

The most important statement that can be made about this passage is also the most obvious: it is written by one who has experienced redemption in Jesus Christ. For such a one the Jewish rites can only serve as a reminder of the fact and the guilt of sin, but this is true only because he stands within the Easter faith. The position both of St. Paul and the author of Hebrews on this matter is clearly summarized by William Manson:

With the declaration of the 'impossibility' attaching to the cultus we may compare St. Paul's analogous affirmation of the disability cleaving to the Law as a system of moral demand (Romans viii.3). St. Paul is indicting the failure of the Law to conquer

the power of sin in our nature, the writer to the Hebrews is impeaching the cultus for its failure to remove the sense of the uncleanness of our souls before God. Both theologians are writing from the standpoint of a higher revelation than Judaism had received...<sup>102</sup>

Thus Christ's offering of perfect obedience "does not abolish the principle of sacrifice... it abolishes the guilt of sin."<sup>103</sup> The repeated rites of the Jewish system were a prophecy or a judgement but never a cure. For the author of Hebrews their distinguishing characteristic is their repeatability. This is not true of the work of Christ.

Christ has entered not a sanctuary made by hands, a mere antitype of the true, but into heaven itself, to appear now in the presence of God on our behalf: and not to offer Himself again and again, as the high-priest enters the holy place year by year, taking with him blood that is not his own. In that case, Christ would have had to suffer over and over again since the world's foundation. As it is, He has been manifested once for all, at the climax of history, to end sin by His sacrifice.<sup>104</sup>

The repeatability of the Jewish rites is contrasted with "the historical once-for-allness"<sup>105</sup> of the Sacrifice of Christ. The crucial point which the author of Hebrews understood so well, is that this self-offering of Christ though revealed in a climactic event in history, an event the results of which both he and St. Paul could experience in a vital way in their own lives, is at the same time not



limited to that event. It is an offering that needs never to be repeated, and yet one that in its eternal aspect has never ceased to be. Manson comments:

It is not denied that the Saviour's Passion is eternal, but its eternity reveals itself in a single act which by the universality of its scope and the utter completeness of its intrinsic quality covers, represents, and supersedes for ever all the shadow - sacrifices which have been offered since time began.<sup>106</sup>

This theme will be discussed at greater length in Chapter III. Were it better understood the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice would at once recommend itself to those areas of the Church where it has been abandoned. The fact that the author of Hebrews grasps its deepest meaning and yet does not develop such a doctrine must be explained primarily on the basis of his eschatology, which will be discussed below.

Lacking the author of Hebrews' understanding of the eternal nature of Christ's oblation, and agreeing with him that the Jewish cultus had been abrogated by the work of Christ, it would not be surprising if other New Testament authors thought of sacrifice only in relation to the death of Christ. The risk of accommodation to current Jewish and pagan conceptions of sacrifice would have created a natural desire not to overshadow or appear to supplement the meritoriousness of the one Sacrifice of Christ offered

on the Cross. In addition to this, a Paul could approach the once-for-all character of the Sacrifice from the perspective of the Law rather than the cultus, and consequently view the supersession of the Jewish means of grace from the courtroom rather than the temple.

...as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men.<sup>107</sup>

### 3.

Eschatological tension between present spiritual realities and hope in an imminent second Coming of Christ

Belief in a sudden Parousia could also suppress the idea of a sacramental means of approach to God in the present. The following quotation from Jeremias' new study of Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries serves to invoke something of the eschatological fervor of New Testament times:

In conclusion, reference must be made to the fact that baptism in the primitive church was an eschatological sacrament. It meant that the person baptized was snatched out of a world delivered over to the immediately impending judgement of God (Acts 2. 38; Col. 1.13) and incorporated into the company of those redeemed by Christ's saving work, an eschatological sealing in the last hour before the catastrophe.<sup>108</sup>

This conviction that the second Advent of the Lord might occur at any moment exerted a strong influence on the New Testament author's agenda. Even a profound thinker like St. Paul devotes greater attention to the ethical

and religious problems relating to the Gospel than he does to constructive theology. In this we are presented not only with an explanation for the lack of a clearly formed doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice in the New Testament, but also a key to understanding the paucity of New Testament teaching about the Eucharist itself. Had the Church at Corinth not abused its communion privileges, we would have heard nothing of the Pauline tradition with regard to the Eucharist.

Vincent Taylor remarks that the author of Hebrews "does not dwell on the opportunity presented by the Eucharist to participate in the very sacrifice which it is his deepest desire to commend."<sup>109</sup> What is the reason for this? Various answers have been given. Taylor himself thinks that the writer became "the victim of his exegetical logic" in using as a type of the Sacrifice of Christ a ritual offering that did not culminate in a communion meal.<sup>110</sup> W.J. Wolf thinks that the problem is "rooted in a more basic one... there is almost no mention made of the love of God as the motive behind the atoning act."<sup>111</sup> However, Manson has pointed to a reason which makes better sense than either of these. It is that the writer to the Hebrews is essentially an eschatologist. For him, as Manson observes, "the eternal world stands essentially in front of us, impending on us as immediate apocalyptic

event,"<sup>112</sup> and his knowledge of this produces "the eschatological tension by which his mind is fixed continuously on the things yet to be hoped for, rather than on present conditions of inward attainment and rest."<sup>113</sup>

This forward thrust belongs to the New Testament and surely accounts, at least in part, for the lack of eucharistic teaching and the undeveloped soteriology that prevented a fuller understanding of the Sacrifice of Christ.<sup>114</sup> It is well to remember that the age which was most devoted to the Sacrifice of the Mass, and nearly misconceived its meaning, took as its Advent theme "the last things," and reduced the vibrant New Testament eschatology to four pat topics: death, judgement, hell and heaven. Our eucharistic devotion needs always to retain the eschatological note which sounded clear in the early Church's Maranatha, "Lord, come!"

A recapitulation of this first stage of the New Testament argument is now in order. There is reason to believe that a doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice did not emerge during the first Christian century because of three historical factors: first, the postexilic attitude which made sacrifice important chiefly as an expression of obedience to God; second, the risk of accommodation to current conceptions of sacrifice as necessarily repeatable

and incomplete in itself; third, the intense futurist expectation of the apostolic church, which in its hope of an early Second Coming failed to emphasize the need for a sacramental means of approach to God in the present.

The Epistle to the Hebrews has been of special importance throughout the discussion. For its writer the 'principle of sacrifice' has not been abolished by the new thing done in Jesus Christ. The once-for-all act of God in history has not denied the eternal significance of the Son's obedience to the Father. Although the eschatological tension in which he found himself prevented his further development of these views, he had laid the cornerstone for the later understanding of the eucharistic oblation.

## Notes for Chapter Two

<sup>1</sup>Sacrificial terms and ideas are found on a wide scale in the New Testament, and some of these in connection with eucharistic teaching (Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24; I Cor. 10:21, 11:25; John 6:53), but there is no discussion of eucharistic sacrifice proper (i.e. in the sense of oblation) as there is of the sacramental communion of believers with Christ in John 6 or the interpretation of Christ's death as a sacrifice in Hebrews 10.

<sup>2</sup>For detailed evidence in support of this contention see Darwell Stone, History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909), I, 42-54, 109-23.

<sup>3</sup>A Lutheran scholar has this to say about traditional Protestant-Catholic division on the theory of sacrifice: "The initial problem revolves about the relation between a view involving a sacrifice given to God with the New Testament presentation of a once-for-all sacrifice remembered now in a meal of fellowship with Christ the Lord and with one's brethren. In any case, for the Protestant, working from a scriptural orientation, this question regarding the original character of the Eucharist must be decisive. Besides the biblical question, the matter of historical growth remains: the idea of sacrifice itself has undergone a historical development through the centuries no less marked than the alterations of the external ritual of the celebration. For the non-Roman Catholic Christian this matter of development constitutes a difficulty scarcely appreciated by his brethren." (Ernest Benjamin Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church [Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954], 113-114.)

<sup>4</sup>"The fundamental principle throughout is the same; the giving of life to promote or preserve life, death being merely a means of liberating vitality. Consequently, the destruction of the victim, to which many writers have given a central position in the rite, assumes a position of secondary importance in comparison with the transmission of the soul-substance to the supernatural being to whom it is offered." (E.O. James, Origins of Sacrifice [London: John Murray, 1933], 256.)

"More and more students of comparative religion and of Old Testament worship in particular, are insisting that the bestowal of life is the fundamental idea in sacrificial worship." (Vincent Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice [London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1955], 55.)

<sup>5</sup>"We need not suppose that throughout the primitive Church the same beliefs were everywhere emphasized in the same way; on the contrary, it is rather to be expected that at some centres certain aspects were appreciated more than others, and in consequence, received greater emphasis, just as in later times and indeed down to the present day." (Vincent Taylor, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching [London: The Epworth Press, 1954], 11.)

<sup>6</sup>Thus Vincent Taylor's interpretation of I Cor. 10:21 (Atonement, op. cit., 70.); traditional Roman Catholic exegesis of Hebrews 13:10 (see The Catholic Encyclopedia, X, 9.).

<sup>7</sup>Infra, p.31f., 105f.

<sup>8</sup>That is to say, the equation blood=life is not only applied to Old Testament sacrificial blood rites but also to occurrences of 'blood' in the New Testament, and it is further claimed that this provides the necessary clue to the meaning of sacrifice in the New Testament period.

"It is a fact worth noting," he says [W. Milligan, The Resurrection of our Lord, 281.] "that the almost uniform practice of the Sacred Writers (exceptions can be easily explained) is to ascribe our salvation to the 'blood', not to the 'death' of Christ; and the two terms, blood and death, are not synonymous." For the blood is the life. The work of our redemption was accomplished, it is true, by death; but nowhere, either in the Synoptic Gospels or in the rest of the New Testament, is the death regarded as an end in itself... The blood, in fact, needs to be dissociated from the idea of death. To us, with our modern associations, it is merely the evidence, the revolting evidence, of slaughter and destruction. To the men of the ancient world it was not revolting, but precious. It was life, once prisoned and misused, now released." (F.C.N. Hicks, The Fullness of Sacrifice [3rd ed.; London: S.P.C.K., 1946], 241-2.)

"Having emptied Himself and become of no account in order to enter into the experience of human life, the Incarnate Son offered Himself in complete surrender and obedience to the will of the Father, pouring out sacrificially before God His lifegiving blood of the new covenant. This in a word is the Pauline interpretation of the sacrifice of Christ..." (E.O. James, op. cit., 268.)

"Sacrifice is a figure of speech which the early Christians, from their knowledge of the typical Jewish sacrifices, could use as one amongst many images to

describe the work of Christ. The essence of the old sacrifices was the offering of an animal's blood which represented its life. The death was necessary to release the blood, but the essence of sacrifice was the offering of the life." (Arthur Michael Ramsey, The Gospel and the Catholic Church [2nd ed.; London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1956], 113.)

"Self-giving and complete obedience to God may certainly be included in the meaning of 'the blood of Christ', but the list of derivative ideas is hopelessly attenuated unless it also includes the thought of life through death and of an offering through which men may draw nigh to God." (Vincent Taylor, Atonement, op. cit., 25.)

"'the blood of Jesus' occupies the centre of the picture. (i) For first of all it is the outpouring of his blood upon Calvary which 'manifests' God's love to the sinner [Gal. 2:19]. The blood spilt signifies the life outpoured in sacrificial libation [Isa. 53:12, Phil. 2:7, 17] before the Father," (L.S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ [2nd ed.; Westminster: Dacre Press, 1946], 167.)

<sup>9</sup>Not, however without incurring some opposition, especially in recent years (see last paragraph of this note).

The history of modern study of the use of the term 'blood' is of considerable interest. It dates from a series of lectures given by H. Clay Trumbull during a Summer School of Hebrew at the Philadelphia Divinity School campus in 1885. When these lectures were published that same year, under the title The Blood Covenant, the book "astonished the scholarly world" with its "remarkable collection of instances, from all over the civilized world, from ancient and more recent times, illustrating the mutual and common use of blood." (R.K. Yerkes, Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952], 220) With regard to Old Testament theology, Trumbull made the following judgement: "Under the symbolic sacrifices of the Old Covenant, it was the blood which made atonement for the soul. It was not the death of the victim, nor yet its broken body, but it was the blood, the life, the soul, that was made the means of a soul's ransom, of its rescue, of its redemption." (H.C. Trumbull, The Blood Covenant [2nd ed.; Philadelphia: John D. Wattles, 1893], 286-7) The locus classicus is Leviticus 17:11 "It is the blood that makes atonement, by reason of the life." Yerkes explains the primitive development of this concept



as follows: "The laconic biblical statement, 'The blood is the life', expresses a conviction not only of ancient Hebrews and later Jews, but of all mankind from the dawn of culture and to the present days of scientific study. It represents one of the first results of human reflection and may therefore be expected to underlie primitive human practices and rites. To think of blood as the seat of life was an obvious conclusion from observing that loss of blood entailed weakness; loss of too much blood meant loss of life. We are familiar with the phrase 'bleeding to death'. If blood is the seat of life, men cannot be faulted for having concluded that it is the life principle. If it is the life principle it ought to be a vehicle of life. It might even be the source of life." (Yerkes, op. cit., 42.) Other studies of anthropology and of comparative religion (e.g. Frazer's Golden Bough, E.O. James' Origins of Sacrifice, and others) supported Trumbull's conclusions with regard to the meaning ascribed by the ancients to the blood of sacrifice; with the result that instead of thinking of sacrifice wholly in terms of the death of a victim, Old Testament scholars began to interpret the death as simply providing a means of liberating life. After a careful study of the subject, however, S.C. Gayford made this important qualification: "It has been the fashion sometimes...to run to the opposite extreme of treating the killing of the victim as a mere incident of no great intrinsic importance. This is a great mistake. 'Apart from the shedding of blood there is no remission'. The offering of the blood still within the body of the victim would represent a life unsundered; to offer some only of the blood drawn from its body would typify the surrender of but a part of the life. The entire surrender of the whole life is essential before it can be given over to God, and therefore nothing less than the death of the victim is required, though but a little of its blood was needed to 'put' on the Horns of the Altar." (Sacrifice and Priesthood [2nd ed.; London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1953], 116.)

Recently, however, a few scholars have gone much further than this, attacking the basic assumption of the majority opinion by arguing that in the Old Testament the word 'blood' symbolizes violent death rather than bestowal of life. The chief proponent of this interpretation has been Principal Leon Morris, who in an article published in 1952 ("The Biblical Use of the Term 'Blood'," The Journal of Theological Studies, III [October, 1952], 216-227.) and in a chapter on "The Blood"

in his book The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross ([Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956], 108-124.) approached the subject through word study and arbitrary reconstruction. A careful critique of his article was given by Canon L. Dewar, who had this to say about Dr. Morris' methods of inquiry: "It is not enough to count the number of times that the word dām occurs in the O.T. ...and proceed to argue that because it is used (as he asserts) twice as often to denote death by violence as to denote the life-blood of sacrifice, the former is the clue to its real meaning. The evidence must be carefully weighed; not only in its immediate context, but also in relation to the development of Hebrew thought." ("The Biblical Use of the Term 'Blood'," The Journal of Theological Studies, IV [October, 1953], 204.) Similarly, Th. C. Vriezen has commented: "The study of the sacrificial cult cannot really be performed without a close examination of the terminology in use. When we set ourselves to do this, we find again and again that terms in use occur in different ways, so that many times various shades of meaning must be distinguished. There is no denying that e.g. such terms as reach, nichoach, lechem panim clearly underwent a change of signification. So the words used may not be taken without comment in the sense of the etymological derivation, nor may they always be apprehended in one fixed sense." After a careful study of the term hizza and its use in the Old Testament language of blood rites he concludes with regard to the Day of Atonement "The sprinkling of the blood upon the kapporeth, which takes the place of the ark (in Old Israel considered as the throne of Jahwe, as the place where God was thought to be living, invisible but really present), may be explained as a presenting the blood to Jahwe Himself." ("The Term Hizza: Lustration and Consecration," in Oudtestamentische Studien, VII [1950], 201, 232.)

<sup>10</sup>Lev. 17:11.

<sup>11</sup>Vincent Taylor claims that is St. Paul's meaning in Eph. 5:25-7. (Atonement, op. cit., 21.)

<sup>12</sup>Infra, p. 34-5.

<sup>13</sup>"The differences between the sacrificial worship of old Israel and that, say, of N.T. times must not, however, be exaggerated. The public cultus did not supersede private sacrifices. The Jews, even from the remoter parts of Palestine, frequented Jerusalem at the feasts in great numbers, bringing the prescribed offerings

and paying their vows; the population of the city itself and of neighboring Judaea alone was sufficient with their sacrifices to give employment and support at ordinary times to a great number of priests. Nor must it be thought that the worshippers were habitually oppressed by a sense of sin, or that the expiatory side of the cultus so dominated their conception of sacrifice as to exclude all others. The contrast sometimes drawn between Dt., with its rejoicing before Yahwe, and P, with all its sin offerings and trespass offerings, even if it fairly represented the spirit of two legislations, cannot legitimately be taken as evidence of a corresponding difference in the spirit of religion in two ages. From our other sources it is easy to show that no such radical difference exists." (G.F. Moore, "Sacrifice," Encyclopaedia Biblica [1903], IV, 4201.)

"Owing to the deeper sense of sin referred to, the sacrificial system assumed a somewhat different aspect; and some new ideas arose, though developed from those of earlier times." W.O.E. Oesterley, Sacrifices in Ancient Israel (New York: The Macmillan Co., \_\_\_\_\_), 219.

Bernard W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), 379.

<sup>14</sup>E.O. James, "Sacrifice: Introductory and Primitive", Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics [1908], XI, 1.

<sup>15</sup>The idea that the primary meaning of sacrifice was that of a gift presented to the god in order to persuade him to act on behalf of the offerer was the theory of E.B. Tylor: "The gift-theory, as standing on its own independent basis, properly takes the first place. That most childlike kind of offering, the giving of a gift with as yet no definite thought how the receiver can take and use it, may be the most primitive as it is the most rudimentary sacrifice." (Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom [Boston: Estes & Lauriat, 1874] II, 376.) The idea is also taken up by S.I. Curtiss: "Sacrifice may be regarded as a gift on the part of the suppliant, which is designed favorably to dispose the being, who is God to him, in some undertaking on which he is about to enter; or to remove his anger. It may be something like a bribe to blind the eyes of deity, a keffareh, so that the divine being who is displeased may overlook the offense on account of which he is angry... It is clear that the necessity for shedding blood does not exclude the character of sacrifice as a gift, nor does it exclude the feast which follows it." (Primitive Semitic Religion Today [Chicago: F.H. Revell Co., 1902], 221-2.)

A.B. Davidson regarded the gift idea as the prevailing principle in Old Testament sacrifices: "Whatever the historical evolution of the idea of sacrifice, or whatever its primary idea, it seems certain that this idea of a gift or offering to God is the prevailing idea in the Hebrew religion from the earliest." (The Theology of the Old Testament [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904], 315.) Buchanan Gray, in his well-known study Sacrifice in the Old Testament stresses the gift element as primary but is careful not to deny the importance of the communion element and other influences. (B. Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament [London: Oxford, 1925], 3.) To this may be added the judgement of H. Wheeler Robinson, who writes: "I should regard the gift theory as giving the widest explanation, and the manipulation of the blood as being one of the chief points of departure." ("Hebrew Sacrifice and Prophetic Symbolism," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIII [1942], 129.)

16 The idea that sacrifice was a communion offering in which the worshipper and the god were bound together by their sharing in the body of the sacrificed animal was championed by W. Robertson Smith: "We can affirm that the idea of a sacrificial meal as an act of communion is older than sacrifice in the sense of tribute...the object of the sacrifice is to provide the material for an act of sacrificial communion with the god." (Lectures on the religion of the Semites: the Fundamental Institutions [3rd ed., edited by S.A. Cook; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927], 245.) His interpretation was followed by F.B. Jevons: "The sacrificial and sacramental meal, has from the beginning also always been a moment in which the consciousness has been present to man of communion with the god of his prayers -- without that consciousness man had no motive to continue the practice of the rite." (An Introduction to the History of Religions [London: Methuen & Co., 1896], 285.) E.O. James writes in his article on sacrifice in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics (op. cit., 6-7): "In the rudimentary form of the rite the communion-theory is adequate to cover most of the facts if it be construed on liberal lines... With the rise of animistic and theistic beliefs, gifts, honorific offerings, and the whole complex system of developed sacrificial ritual are gradually added to the original rite."

17 The idea that sacrifice released the power of life by the death of the animal has been advocated by E.O. James and many others (supra, n.'s 4,9).

<sup>18</sup>See statements by Curtiss, H.W. Robinson, and E.O. James (supra, n.'s 14,15).

<sup>19</sup>"Within the thought of the Old Testament, no one of these views can give us the clue to the interpretation of all sacrifice... no simple idea will suffice to explain the meaning of it all. Some sacrifices were thought of as gifts; others as means of effecting communion with God; others as having a propitiatory significance. Some were wholly consumed on the altar; some were partly consumed on the altar and partly given to the priests; in some the worshipper himself had a share." (H.H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXIII [September, 1950], 78, 83.)

J.P.E. Pedersen, Israel, III-IV: its Life and Culture (London: Oxford University Press, 1940), 299.

Oesterley, op. cit., 23.

<sup>20</sup>Oesterley, op. cit., 95-235. It should be noted that his case for the presence of the life-giving idea in the postexilic period is the least convincing. Oesterley makes the following three points:

1. The postexilic system contained all the earlier types of sacrifice. "We may maintain, therefore, on a priori grounds, that these three main purposes continued." (231)
2. No explanation is given as to how or why the outpouring of blood should have taken away sin, but it is 'perhaps' suggested by Lev. 17:11. (225)
3. "The purificatory effect of blood, so characteristic of postexilic thought, (Indeed, Oesterley includes with approval [225] Lods' argument that it was the 'guiding principle' behind the blood-sprinkling.) in no way detracts from the original life-giving purpose of the blood-offering." (234)

<sup>21</sup>Which, in fact, did not exist in many cases. It is important to remember that the faith and practice of Israel at any period may have differed widely from the faith and practice of the canonical Old Testament. (Th C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958], 277.4)

<sup>22</sup>Leviticus 17:11.

<sup>23</sup>"In the Pentateuch the sacrificial ritual is indeed copiously described, but nowhere in the Old Testament is its significance formally explained; this is treated as on the whole self-evident and familiar to every one." (Julius

Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel [New York: Meridian Books, 1958], 61.)

"A theory of the way in which sacrifices and other rites expiate sin is in a revealed religion a superfluous speculation." (G. Moore, Judaism [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927], 500.)

"Nowhere do they explain precisely how the sacrificial blood expiated sin, and why it had atoning efficacy. As an established datum, a universally accepted necessity, the altar of sacrifice was its own explanation." (J.S. Whale, Victor and Victim [Cambridge: The University Press, 1960], 48.)

<sup>24</sup>G.F. Moore, Encyclopaedia Biblica, op. cit., 4185. Infra, n. 26 (2nd paragraph).

<sup>25</sup>H.H. Guthrie, Jr., God and History in the Old Testament (Greenwich, Conn., The Seabury Press, 1960), 139.

<sup>26</sup>The old critical theory incorporating a 'documentary analysis' of the Pentateuch seems moribund. According to this theory, for example, it is incorrect to speak of the covenant idea existing in the Patriarchal period. The stories of Abraham, Issac, and Jacob are merely a national epic expressing the concepts of the Kingdom period. Thus C.A. Simpson in his exegesis of Genesis 12 in The Interpreter's Bible (I, 571-2) refers to Abraham not as a person but as a personification of Israel created by the builders of national tradition in order that their desert origin might be preserved in the figure of a great leader whose move from the desert into Palestine "certainly was not undertaken, at least consciously, in response to a specific divine command, however mediated... To all outward appearances it was just another of the many migrations of people which occurred in the ancient world, and was so regarded by the Israelites, in the unlikely event that they gave the matter any thought whatever." Any personal bond between Abraham and his God outside of tribal considerations is apparently unthinkable. However, this reactionary literary-critical approach, which does not adequately take into account the importance of archaeological findings, is vitiated by a study of the Patriarchal narratives against the background of East Mediterranean literary epic and social practice of the mid-second-millennium. (Cyrus H. Gordon, The World of the Old Testament [Garden City: Doubleday Company, Inc., 1958], 15-32; W.F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity [Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957], 241.) The



concept of a personal relationship with one's god is well known among the Hittites from texts of the Amarna Age and later, and a good example of this is found in "The Apology of Hattusilis I" lines 36 and following which gives an account of the relationship between Hattusilis and Ishtar, and once she says to him "Shall I abandon you to a (hostile) deity? Fear thou not!" (E.H. Sturtevant and G.B. Bechtel, A Hittite Chrestomathy [Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, University of Penn., 1935], 67.) For an adequate appreciation of the covenant idea in the Patriarchal period see John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), 91-3.

Genesis 15:7-11 provides another demonstration of the historical value of the Patriarchal narratives, as well as further evidence for the existence of sacrifice during the nomadic period of Israel's history. The ritual there described includes the dividing of animals, which is paralleled only in Hittite sources (as far as present knowledge can say). It is not a part of the Levitical ritual and would apparently not even be suitable for practice within the courts of the Temple. Abraham performs the sacrifice on open ground and in the Hittite examples a sacrifice of this type is performed outside of the city walls. Why, we may ask, would a later writer assign to the Patriarch a foreign ritual? And how would he know of it?

<sup>27</sup>I follow Mendenhall in his support of the Israelite tradition regarding the Covenant at Sinai as the event which brought Israel into existence as a distinct religious community (a view rejected by Wellhausen, who regarded the religious community as the product of very gradual growth [Britannica, 9th ed., XIII, 296f.]). The existence of a covenant-bound community of tribes as a religious federation in the period of Judges can be understood and explained best on the assumption that it is a conscious continuation and re-adaptation of an earlier tradition which goes back to the time of Moses. Mendenhall argues that the Sinaitic Covenant was the formal means by which the semi-nomadic clans which had recently escaped from bondage in Egypt were bound together in a religious and political community. Only in this way could such a community be made responsible to new obligations; and as essentially a promissory oath with religious sanction, it was the only means (excepting overwhelming physical force) that a legal and political community could expand to include other already existing social units. (George E. Mendenhall, "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law," Biblical Archaeologist, XVII, 24-46.)

28 The sacrifice on this occasion is of the Peace Offering class (reckoned among private sacrifices during the postexilic period and found in three forms: the votive offering, the free-will offering and the thank offering, into the distinctions between which for our purpose it is not necessary to), that is to say, an offering which includes as part of its ceremonial a common meal. The most joyous of all the animal sacrifices in Israel because it is not a sacrifice to make peace with an offended God but the expression of a peace already existing when the offering is made, (It was forbidden to anyone who was "unclean" [Lev. 7:20]) it is also a good illustration of the development of ideas associated with sacrifice. In its earliest form it represents the belief that by sharing in a common meal on the sacred flesh and blood of the totem animal the sacrificers appropriated to themselves his unique characteristics. Later, when the animal and god were differentiated, the sacrificial feast was viewed as a common meal between man and god in which the former experienced communion with the latter. These two ideas form the background for the view of the common meal in Israelite sacrifice, where it assumes the role of a fellowship meal with God. In the most primitive times the blood of the animal was drunk by the worshippers. Later the sacredness of the blood, thought to contain life, resulted in the strict prohibition of drinking blood in the Old Testament (Gen. 9:4; Lev. 3:17; 17:10, 11, 14; 19:26. Deut. 12:16, 23. I Sam. 14:31-35. Ezekiel 33:25.) Thus in the sacrifice we are discussing the "blood of the Covenant" is applied to the altar (as representing God) and the people. The idea may be that God and his people are in this way united by sharing in a common life-blood through being consecrated by its touch. Gayford suggests that "Something of the same train of thought most probably lay behind the putting of the blood on the doorpost in the original Passover ceremony." (Gayford, op. cit., 35-40; Oesterley, op. cit., 223f.)

29 "An inextricable part", not "an essential expression" of that meaning. The distinction is crucial. The cultic rationale and the cultus itself cannot be separated from each other. Without the outward form the inward meaning is vacuous. "The ceremonial is fixed and traditional, but the meaning is fluid and progressive. The law of sacrifice says 'This do', not 'This think'; and the path of progress lies, not only in the abolition of what is meaningless or degrading, but in putting a better meaning upon what is retained." (H.L. Goudge, "Sacrifice in the Old Testament,"



Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, Subject: The Holy Eucharist, London, July, 1927 [Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1927], 69.) The point here is that something, in all events, is retained: the institution of sacrifice under the Old Covenant (though not all of its rites) and the essential matter and form of the Dominical Sacrament under the New. This, for the community that witnesses to a God who acts in history, is unanswerable authority. Infra, n. 35.

<sup>30</sup>Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, op. cit., 280.

"The whole course of the sacrifices was regarded as belonging to the covenant system. We have seen that the latest of them -- the atoning sacrifices -- presupposed the covenant; and each kind in its different way was a method of restoring, acknowledging, or renewing and enjoying the covenant relationship. Sacrifice was, in fact, to the Jewish mind an essential feature of a covenant." (Hicks, op. cit., 22; the underlining is mine.)

<sup>31</sup>"In all these expressions of the covenantal idea" writes Wheeler Robinson, "we must think of a redeemer-God who acts through history and in individual lives, because of what He is and of His freely assumed relation to His people." (H. Wheeler Robinson, Redemption and Revelation [London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1942], 227.)

<sup>32</sup>Numbers 5:5-8; also Lev. 5:5f.

<sup>33</sup>Cf. Amos 4:4, 5:21f.; Hos. 6:6, 8:11f., 14:3f.; Isa. 1:11f., 22:12f., 28:7f.; Jer. 6:20, 7:21-2; Mic. 6:6-8.

<sup>34</sup>Wellhausen, op. cit., 423. It would be easy to multiply quotations from scholars who have represented prophetic religion as the complete antithesis of priestly. In 1903, the justly-famous Jewish scholar George Foot Moore, in his article on 'Sacrifice' in the Encyclopaedia Biblica, recorded what was probably the majority opinion among scholars at the time: "The prophets of the eighth century not only denounce the abuses and corruptions of the worship at the temples and high places... they deny the efficacy of sacrifice altogether." (op. cit., 4221.) Similarly, J.A. Bewer wrote in 1922: "Religion was a matter of the cult. The earlier prophets had violently protested against such a conception of religion and rejected the entire cultic apparatus as contrary to the will of God." (The Literature of the Old Testament [New York: Columbia University Press, 1957], 267.)

<sup>35</sup>H.H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible (London: The Carey Kingsgate Press Ltd., 1953.), 33.

Having gained an understanding of the importance of the Israelite view of history for an appreciation of Old Testament theology, it is ironic that a new form of the old Liberal Protestant argument should appear. H.H. Guthrie, in his God and History in the Old Testament (1960), selects the so-called 'J Document' (supra, n. 26) and the prophets as "the main line of biblical faith" (op. cit., 144) and while recognizing that the prophets did not intend to disassociate themselves from the cultus, proceeds to interpret the sacrificial system as quite secondary to the only really important theme, viz: the witness to a God whose purpose is revealed in history. "There's a very real sense in which the point of view of the Old Testament could not find cultic expression. The wholeness could not be until history got where it was going. Any attempt to effect atonement or say what atonement is until the end is going to be frustrated." (Guthrie, T 214 lecture [October 4, 1960]) This is really only a kind of historicizing of the basic tenet of the old Liberal Protestant school, namely that external forms are not necessary for the expression of a purely moral and spiritual religion. It fails to do justice to the fact of a covenant relation established between God and his people, and the daily sacramental realization of that covenant at the altar of sacrifice. Guthrie is certainly right in claiming that the concept of Israel as a holy community, offering sacrifices according to the Law, became a 'crystallization' in the postexilic period, and that as such it could undermine the forward view so important to a people whose God made his will known in the events of history (op. cit., 144.); but he who desires to take history seriously must confront the fact that the cultus continued as a means of grace right into the New Testament period. Guthrie writes: "the New Testament would define Christianity simply as the fulfillment of the law and the prophets." (op. cit., 149-50.) The author of Hebrews would also declare that the Work of Christ had lifted sacrifice into a new dimension, and the Dominical Sacrament would continue the use of 'forms' under the New Covenant.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., 30-61.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., 42-3.

In the same year that Rowley's book was published, interesting evidence of a similar attitude on the part of Jews living at a later time and in different circum-

stances was produced by study of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Joseph M. Baumgarten, in his article on "Sacrifice and Worship Among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumrân) Scrolls," commented as follows: "It should be noted that the division was not primarily over the desirability of animal sacrifice, as such. Just as the Prophetic protests were directed against those who would bring offerings to hide evil and injustice (Amos 5:22-7), so did these sectarians denounce the transgressions of the priests at Jerusalem, without denying the importance of sacrifice. It is not surprising, therefore, to find in CDC ["Cairo Fragments of a Damascene Covenant"] several laws relating to animal offerings." (Harvard Theological Review XLVI [July, 1953], 145.)

<sup>38</sup>"The offering of sacrifice, at any rate prior to the centralisation of worship in the reign of Josiah, was the practical religious expression of the individual who was bound only by traditional usage; it entered into everyday life according to the wants which arose and which affected private individuals. On certain special occasions, such as the annual feasts, the offering of sacrifice had assumed a more official character. But these were exceptions; as a general rule, apart from the Temple worship, the local sanctuaries were for the benefit of individuals rather than centres of organized official worship. After the Exile it became very different. The sacrificial system assumed the character of a national expression of the desire for a state of rectitude in accordance with divine law." (Oesterley, op. cit., 218.)

<sup>39</sup>Gayford, op. cit., 36.

<sup>40</sup>Gayford, op. cit., 43-4.

"Like other ancient monarchs, the kings of Judah and Israel built temples at old holy places, such as Bethel, and in their capitals, as at Jerusalem and Samaria. Worship at these royal sanctuaries was under the direction of the sovereign; on great occasions the king in person offered sacrifice in them (I K. 8:5, 64; esp. 9:25 II K. 16:12ff.); the priests were appointed by him. It was probably in these temples that the custom of offering a daily holocaust grew up. This sacrifice was made early in the morning; in the late afternoon the oblation of bread or dough, oil, wine (the minhâh) was presented (see I K. 18:29, 36, cp Dan. 9:21 Ezra 9:4f.)" (Moore, op. cit., 4195-96.)

<sup>41</sup>Moore, op. cit., 4197; Oesterley, op. cit., 125.

<sup>42</sup>"Throughout the Old Testament the offering of a gift in the Sacrifices completely overshadows the idea of seeking communion with God. There are, perhaps, indications of a time when the Peace Offering was the only form of Sacrifice; but, as far as the actual evidence takes us back in the Old Testament, the Burnt Offering always appears side by side with the Peace Offering. And the whole aim and object of the Burnt Offering was the offering of a gift to God. No part of the victim was left either for Priest or for offerer; the whole was surrendered to God. Several other facts show how prominent in the historical period was the idea of the gift. In pre-exilic times the generic name for the thing offered in all Sacrifices was minhah (= a tributary gift). After the Exile this word was confined to the offering of the fruits of the field, but the general word for Offering, the familiar corban (qorban), also meant a gift or present. The ordinary term for offering a Sacrifice (higrib, from the same root as corban) means "to present" (lit. "to bring near"). These facts show how strongly the Jews associated the idea of the gift with their Sacrifices, and how completely the idea of communion had retired into the background." (Gayford, op. cit., 15.)

"It has been remarked more than once, but the point needs emphasis, that in the case of almost every kind of sacrifice more than one purpose prompts the offering of it. Practically every sacrifice can, in some sense, come under the gift-category, inasmuch as the initial presentation of it constitutes a gift." (Oesterley, op. cit., 143.)

See Wheeler Robinson's statement, supra, n. 15.

<sup>43</sup>"From first to last the utmost importance attaches to the disposition of the victim's blood, indeed, it may be said that this is one universal and indispensable constituent of sacrifice." (Moore, op. cit., 4217.) The presenting of the blood is the culmination of the Sin Offering, though it is important to note that the victim's death is a preliminary and indispensable condition. See Gayford, op. cit., 116-117. Also Oesterley, op. cit., 177-190, 225; Vriezen, "The Term Hizza: Lustration and Consecration," op. cit., 201-235. Supra, n. 28.

<sup>44</sup>J. Bright, op. cit., 323.

<sup>45</sup>John Bright, op. cit., 323-432.

It is therefore easy to represent the cultus of the restoration community, with its vision of the Holy People of God offering sacrifices according to the law, as a particularistic tendency wholly opposed to the universalism of a Second Isaiah. To this there are insuperable objections, as Bright has pointed out. First, the postexilic prophets, though concerned with the purity of the community, showed also a universalistic tendency in their view of the eventual inclusion of all peoples within Zion (Isa. 56:1-8; 66:18-21; Zech. 2:11; 8:22f; Mal. 1:11). Second, the law provided for the acceptance of proselytes to Judaism (Lev. 24:22; Ezek. 47:22). Third, the cultus itself, while it provided for Israel an approach to God in the present, was far from denying the future reign of Yahweh over all people (Ps. 9:7f; 47; 93; 96-99). (431-2)

<sup>46</sup>B. Gray, op. cit., 82.

<sup>47</sup>"Of the sacrifices more closely connected with sin there were the sin offering and the guilt offering in postexilic times, though these do not figure in the pre-exilic sources of the Old Testament that have come down to us. This does not mean that they were post-exilic inventions, however, and the fact that in Lev. v, 1-9 they appear to be identified, and that they cannot now be distinguished with precision, is against such a supposition." (H.H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," op. cit., 85.) For the likelihood of pre-exilic observance of the annual Day of Atonement see Vriezen, "The Term Hizza: Lustration and Consecration," op. cit., 220-1. Oesterley will not grant a pre-exilic date for the Day of Atonement "as a special celebration, apart from the ritual details" (op. cit., 226), but with regard to the rite of the transference of sin to the victim by the imposition of hands on its head and confession of sin over it he says, "Though occurring only in postexilic literature, the idea and the rite must have had a long history behind them." (op. cit., 269.) This was Gray's opinion also (op. cit., 315f.).

<sup>48</sup>E.O. James refers to propiation as "an essential attribute of the institution of sacrifice" (op. cit., 192.). Gray (op. cit., 53.) and Oesterley (op. cit., 76, 92f.) make carefully guarded statements on the matter. Edmond Jacob (*infra*, n. 55) find propiation to be only one element in Old Testament sacrifice

(Theology of the Old Testament [New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958], 269.) Millar Burrows finds it to be a prominent element but adds: "The most characteristic biblical conception of atonement, however, is that of a redemption which proceeds from God himself. The same Hebrew verb used for ritual purification is also used with God as the subject in such a way that it can only be translated 'forgive' or the like... As a matter of fact, while it can be used of appeasing an angry man with a gift, it is never used in the Old Testament in the sense 'appease' or 'propitiate' with God as object." (An Outline of Biblical Theology [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956], 221.) When we pass from studies in biblical theology to studies in systematic theology the statements are more categorical: "There is no evidence for a statement or even a hint that God is 'propitiated', as that word is conventionally used. He is always the first mover in the work of reconciliation." (Whale, op. cit., 52.) "Expiation and propitiation were, as we have seen, twin motives in the sacrificial rites of Ancient Israel, rites which were bound up with the theory of atonement or redemption (apolytrosis) by substitution." (E.L. Kendall, A Living Sacrifice [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960], 81.)

<sup>49</sup>Kendall, op. cit., 73.

<sup>50</sup>Supra, p. 9-10.

<sup>51</sup>G. Ernest Wright, The Rule of God, Essays in Biblical Theology (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1960), 69.

<sup>52</sup>Norman K. Gottwald, A Light to the Nations (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), 455. Cf. A.G. Hebert, The Authority of the Old Testament (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), 148-158.

<sup>53</sup>S.C. Gayford treats the vexed question of the meaning of kipper and concludes that whether the original sense is "to cover" or "to wipe," general Old Testament usage indicates that both "the reconciliation of the sinner and the undoing of the sin must be included in the connotation of the phrase." (op. cit., 100-103.) Most scholars agree with this judgement. A.G. Hebert writes: "...both meanings are biblical and are expressed also in other words. Great caution is, however, necessary in using the words 'propitiation' and 'expiation', because these are all too readily interpreted in the light of the meanings which they bear in the Greek and Latin

classics" ("Atone," A Theological Word Book of the Bible [New York: The Macmillan Co., 1959], 25a.)

<sup>54</sup>C.R. North, "Sacrifice," A Theological Word Book of the Bible, op. cit., 213b. But note the view of Edmond Jacob: "Without seeking to reduce the body of Israelite sacrifices to a single type, we can affirm that substitution is at the basis of the burnt offering (Lev. 1.4) as well as of the sacrifice for sin, chatta't (Lev. 4.20), and of the guilt offering, 'asham (Lev. 5.16). The victim plays a substitutionary role..." (op. cit., 294.)

<sup>55</sup>O. Quick, The Gospel of the New World (London: Nisbet, 1944.), 100-101.

<sup>56</sup>Gray op. cit., 315f.; Yerkes, op. cit., 134. Jacob agrees that "This episode (the scapegoat) stresses the removal of sin." (op. cit., 296.)

<sup>57</sup>Infra, p. 37.

<sup>58</sup>Davidson, op. cit., 315.

<sup>59</sup>Ezekiel 18, 33, 36.

<sup>60</sup>Jacob, op. cit., 290.

<sup>61</sup>Frederick C. Grant, Ancient Judaism and the New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1959), 62. We may also add this observation by W.J. Wolf: "It is quite possible... that developed Jewish piety... may have outrun the official limitations of the system as recorded in the documents. It is difficult to believe that pious Jews should for generations have inconvenienced themselves to go up to the temple in Jerusalem for nothing more than the forgiveness of sins which they had unconsciously committed. Suggestions in the Psalter may point to deeper experiences of reconciliation and forgiveness through the system of sacrifice." (No Cross, No Crown [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1957.], 42.)

<sup>62</sup>C.F.D. Moule, The Sacrifice of Christ (Greenwich; Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1957), 23.

<sup>63</sup>H.W. Robinson, "Hebrew Sacrifice and Prophetic Symbolism," op. cit., 131.

<sup>64</sup>Whale, op. cit., 49.



<sup>65</sup>Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, op. cit., 284.

<sup>66</sup>H.W. Robinson, Redemption and Revelation, op. cit., 227.

<sup>67</sup>"The final form of the sacrificial law of the Old Testament comes to us from men who valued the prophetic teaching, and the age of Judaism treasured alike the Law and the Prophets. It sought by the Law to guard the prophetic principles, and it conceived of the ritual as the organ of obedience, not the substitute for it, But it is clear that it conceived of the ritual as potent, and not alone as acceptable, and the power with which it was charged as divine power." (H.W. Robinson, "Hebrew Sacrifice and Prophetic Symbolism," op. cit., 136.)

<sup>68</sup>H.H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," op. cit., 109-110.

<sup>69</sup>Bright, op. cit., 442-3.

<sup>70</sup>The concluding sentences of Rowley's article are an example of this: "Yet all the animal sacrifices failed to meet man's need, since the sins that most needed cleansing were beyond the range of their power. A sacrifice greater than any the Law provided, and more far-ranging in its power, was therefore envisaged in the O.T., and its deepest word on sacrifice speaks of one never offered on the altar of the Temple or provided in the ritual of the Pentateuch, but one to which it looked forward beyond the O.T. itself." (op. cit., 110.)

<sup>71</sup>Bright, op. cit., 426-8.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., 426.

<sup>73</sup>"... the true significance of the sacrificial element undeniably present in New Testament teaching is to be found, not so much in the specific rites of the cultus, as in the underlying ideas of sacrifice..." (V. Taylor, op. cit., 187.)

<sup>74</sup>John Knox considers sacrifice one of the two categories in which all New Testament conceptions of the meaning of the death of Christ can be grouped. (The Death of Christ [New York: Abingdon Press, 1958], 144f.)



- <sup>75</sup>Bright, op. cit., 416.
- <sup>76</sup>H.H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," op. cit., 104.
- <sup>77</sup>Oesterley, op. cit., 218.
- <sup>78</sup>H.H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible, op. cit., 43.
- <sup>79</sup>Ibid., 43.
- <sup>80</sup>Bright, op. cit., 416.
- <sup>81</sup>Supra, n. 8.
- <sup>82</sup>Austin M. Farrer, "Eucharist and Church in the New Testament," The Parish Communion (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), 89.
- <sup>83</sup>Jacob, op. cit., 269.
- <sup>84</sup>Romans 6:19. Cf. Phil. 2:8.
- <sup>85</sup>Supra, p. 4f.
- <sup>86</sup>Farrer, op. cit., 89.
- <sup>87</sup>Supra, n. 8.
- <sup>88</sup>Farrer, op. cit., 89.
- <sup>89</sup>James S. Stewart, A Man in Christ (New York: Harper and Brothers, \_\_\_\_), 237-8. W.D. Davies makes a great deal of obedience, regarding it as "the essential category in Paul's understanding of the death of Jesus" and interpreting it in close connection with Jewish ideas of solidarity, especially under the Covenant. (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism [London: S.P.C.K., 1948], 227-84.)
- <sup>90</sup>William Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951), 110.
- <sup>91</sup>Taylor, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching, op. cit., 122.
- <sup>92</sup>Principal F.J. Taylor, in a recent article on "The Will of God in the Epistle to the Hebrews," summarizes this important teaching as follows:

"Thus the conditions of human life including sin and its consequences became the means whereby the obedience of the Son was tested and perfected. Although He was a Son, He learned obedience through what He suffered, 'being made perfect' (5:8-9) and this process is declared to be consonant with the Will of the Father.... The meaning of the process is made clear in the triumphant issue of these trials and the efficacy of the complete self-giving of the Son to the Father in the obedience of life and the sacrifice of death.

The particular virtue of the sacrifice of Christ was seen by the author of this letter to lie in the fact that it was a free and full offering of the self in obedience and love to the Father 'It is impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins' (10:4) for at their best such animal sacrifices were imperfect substitutes for that self-offering of persons in loving response, which God had always desired. The imperfection of all human self-giving, as well to God as to fellow-man, is redeemed in the perfect offering of Christ, as by the example of a unique deed towards which nevertheless He constantly draws those who trust in Him, having become 'the source of eternal salvation to all who obey him' (5:9), and thus fitted to deal adequately with human weakness and sin. The sacrificial act of Christ in His dying was not only the final achievement of filial self-oblation, but, as it was accomplished by the Will of God, so in this deed and by its virtue mankind has been consecrated to the good and perfect Will of God. 'Lo, I have come to do thy will... And by that will we have been consecrated through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all' (10:9-10). (The Expository Times, LXXII [March, 1961], 169. The underlining is mine)

<sup>93</sup>Thornton, op. cit., 167.

<sup>94</sup>If this view of the matter is accepted, it should be clear that Vincent Taylor is mistaken in making the following criticism of Johannes Behm's interpretation of "the blood of Christ."

"In a recent discussion, Johannes Behm has described the phrase 'blood of Christ' as like 'Cross', 'only a more vivid expression for the death of Christ in its redemptive significance'. It may be doubted whether this explanation sufficiently accounts for a term which is used so frequently, and which by its associations is linked, as 'Cross' is not, with the ideas of the Old Testament sacrificial system. Behm denies that the ideas of the cultus (kultische Opfergedanken) were connected with the phrase, and interprets

it as a symbolic clothing of the idea of self-giving, of complete obedience over against God, which Jesus manifested in His death upon the Cross. This opinion, it may be suspected, marks the revulsion of the modern man from the thought of blood sacrifices and attaches too little importance to the ancient significance of blood as the symbol of life freely offered for men. It is quite true, as Behm points out, that in later Judaism the older ideas appeared faded and spiritualized, as the symbols of personal and ethical activities; but it does not follow that the same process must have been followed in the New Testament period, only accelerated, so that 'the blood of Christ' becomes a mere figure of speech." (The Atonement in New Testament Teaching, op. cit., 24.)

95 "And by him every one that believes is freed from everything from which you could not be freed by the law of Moses." (Acts 13:39)

"For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." (Hebrews 10:4)

96 "Then as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men." (Romans 5:18)

"For Christ also died for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God..." (I Peter 3:18)

This phrase, "once for all," is repeated again and again in Hebrews. Christ did not need to offer repeated sacrifices, like the priests of the old covenant. He did this "once for all when he offered up himself" (Heb. 7:27; cf. 9:25f.). "He entered once for all into the Holy Place... thus securing an eternal redemption." (Heb. 9:12) "But when Christ had offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God, there to wait until his enemies should be made a stool for his feet. For by a single offering he has perfected for all time those who are consecrated." (Heb. 10:12-14)

97 Supra, p.s 18-20.

98 Supra, p. 20, n. 62.

99 Taylor, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching, op. cit., 80-1.

100 Ibid., 82. "Concerning forgiveness he has very little to say, and he never represents it as the object for which Christ died. Apart from the passages in which

To the Old Testament Jew sacrifice was, as Wheeler Robinson says, "meaningful to a degree far beyond a figurative and merely declaratory symbolism."<sup>63</sup> It was repeated because God had revealed that this should be so. "In short, the sacrifice is a sacral act expiating the uncleanness of the sinner and declaring that wrath is not the ultimate truth about God: it is a means of grace which God himself has ordained and provided."<sup>64</sup>

In arriving at any final estimate of the significance of the institution of sacrifice in the postexilic period of Israel's history, it is important to recognize both that the cultus was a necessity and that it could not continue forever.

As regards the first point, we can begin by recalling what has been said about the role of sacrifice in the continuation of the covenant relationship between Yahweh and his people. The increased awareness of sin and the demand for greater obedience to the demands of the law gave the cultus as important place in postexilic culture.

If we want to gain a correct understanding of the Israelite cult we must therefore see it against the background of the doctrine of the holiness of God, of the sinfulness of man and of the Covenant between this holy God and this sinful man.<sup>65</sup>

Indeed, Robinson refers to the postexilic sacrificial system as "a multiplied renewal of the covenantal relation."<sup>66</sup> Nor can there be any reasonable doubt that in spite of the formalization of the cultus in the later period it could have profound meaning for the individual as well as the community. When infused with the prophetic spirit of repentance, sacrifice was capable of deep spiritual meaning. It could be, in fact, the organ of divine power.<sup>67</sup>

Rather have we gone...to the underlying thought of all sacrifice as the organ of the offerer's presentation of himself to God, the bearer of his spirit to the exalted Being he approached, and therefore meaningless unless he brought with it the appropriate spirit. It is not as an external act charged with his spirit. Yet neither can sacrifice be understood merely as man's approach to God. It is also God's approach to him, charged with power.<sup>68</sup>

Yet it is also true that the institution of sacrifice could not continue forever. It is important to realize why this was so. It was not because of the failure of the cultus to express the distinctive Old Testament point of view. That would be to divide Israel's hope from her present experience of God's grace, to halve her existence. Nor was it because that hope gradually changed from the old Israel's lively sense of history into a settled conviction that only the future would bring the action of God in history - although

that is what happened.<sup>69</sup> Still less was it because the Old Testament looked forward to the perfecting of sacrifice. That is a Christian re-interpretation.<sup>70</sup> It was rather because the postexilic demand for obedience eventually substituted law for covenant,<sup>71</sup> the Torah for the altar of sacrifice.

Thus emergent Judaism watched and waited, and some preferred to watch and some preferred to wait. Sacrifice probably meant more to those who waited without much hope that continued obedience to the law would bring more than a continuing need for atonement. Having reduced the brave concept of the Suffering Servant - whose submission under God to whatever history may bring is the preparation for the final time - to a principle of devotional piety,<sup>72</sup> they were finally to lose their forward view altogether and completely surrender themselves to the law. The watchers preferred fantastic hopes portrayed in fantastic imagery. The Day of Yahweh would bring not the judgement that the prophets had foretold, but a thorough vindication of Israel. When that Day failed to fulfill their expectations, they refused to believe that it had come.

### C. Sacrifice in the New Testament

In the preceding section we have been concerned with the institution of sacrifice in the Old Testament, particularly with regard to its significance as a part of the religion of Yahweh. New Testament Christianity found meaning not in the cultus itself, but in certain ideas behind sacrificial worship.<sup>73</sup> Recent converts to Christianity might stray from the Gospel, it is true, but all of the New Testament authors clearly believed that the old means of grace had been superseded by the Sacrifice of Christ.

This section is not a study in New Testament soteriology. It is taken for granted here that a sacrificial interpretation of the Atonement is part of the New Testament understanding of the work of Christ.<sup>74</sup> Neither is it an attempt to delineate all the ideas behind sacrificial worship that were used by the New Testament authors to describe what God had done in Christ. What this final section deals with is the question that was raised at the beginning of the chapter: Are there fundamental influences which can be said to underlie the sacrificial teaching of the New Testament writings and account for their lack of direct teaching on the theme of eucharistic sacrifice?

Of key importance for such a study is the Epistle to the Hebrews, and this for two reasons. First, whereas the other New Testament writings make only a limited use of sacrificial terms and ideas, Hebrews contains extended meditations on the meaning of Christ's death in terms of sacrifice. Second, Hebrews may illustrate the situation we are trying to evaluate better than any other New Testament writing. In spite of its use of sacrificial motifs, it contains no eucharistic teaching! All of this is not meant to infer that Hebrews is a representative New Testament writing, nor, on the other hand, to ignore the possibility that influences which can be detected in one quarter of the first century Church could not have been operative elsewhere. It must be frankly admitted that the proposed study is speculative, but it is not meant to establish an unimpeachable truth. It has achieved its purpose if it merely provides plausible reasons to show why the patristic doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice did not emerge in New Testament terms.

At least the following three influences, effecting all or nearly all of the New Testament writings, may have provided a negative influence on the development of a doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice: first, the dominance of the postexilic attitude toward sacrifice in the New



Testament period; second, emphasis upon the inadequacy of sacrifice under the old covenant and the once-for-all character of the sacrifice of Christ; third, eschatological tension between present spiritual realities and hope in an imminent second coming of Christ. Of the three reasons, the first is undoubtedly the most important and has the widest range of application, since it is difficult to imagine a view of eucharistic sacrifice emerging if the regnant sacrificial motif does not readily adapt itself to such a view.

1.

The dominance of the postexilic attitude toward sacrifice in the New Testament period

It will be remembered from what has been said in the preceding section on sacrifice in the Old Testament that the postexilic period of Israel's history brought a new emphasis on obedience to the law as the basis for community existence. A scrupulous following of the law had always been an important part of the religious life of the pious Jew, but after the destruction of the old national-cultic community it gradually took on a new meaning and significance.

Originally the definition of action on the basis of covenant, it became itself the basis of action, virtually a synonym for covenant and the sum and substance of religion. The cult was regulated and supported by the law; to be moral and pious was to keep the law.<sup>75</sup>

Indeed, H.H. Rowley has called the postexilic period "the Golden Age of universal obedience to God's will,"<sup>76</sup> and another Old Testament scholar writes: "Sacrifices (after the Exile) were offered in order to do the will of God as ordained in His law."<sup>77</sup>

If this is true, if the fundamental Jewish motive for sacrificing in the New Testament period was the desire to do God's will, and if, as we have seen, "it was not the act alone that mattered, but the act as charged with the spirit of the worshipper,"<sup>78</sup> was not that spirit also to be primarily one of submission and obedience? The pre-exilic prophets had come preaching pardon upon repentance, and, if it could be said they taught "It was by obedience that the real attitude of the heart was expressed,"<sup>79</sup> how much more was this likely to be the case in the time when the Torah had become, as John Bright says, "the sum and substance of religion?"<sup>80</sup>

Mention has been made of the fact that an increasing number of scholars have suggested that for the authors of the New Testament blood meant not death but life.<sup>81</sup> But, as Farrer remarks, "such ideas belonged to a distant past."<sup>82</sup> The fundamental motive in offering sacrifice in the cultic tradition of the New Testament period seems to have been the desire to fulfill

the law through obedience to its commands, rather than the primitive thought of liberating life through death. There is no evidence to suggest that the authors of the New Testament thought of sacrifice as "the act through which God reveals and communicates his life-force, in which man receives infinitely more than he brings and in which it follows that the sacramental element takes precedence of the truly sacrificial element."<sup>83</sup> If such had been the first century Jewish belief with regard to sacrifice, the author of the sixth chapter of the Gospel According to St. John would have called the eucharist a sacrifice. Sacrifice for the New Testament authors represented primarily not the gift of life but the gift of radical obedience, an obedience unto death.

For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by one man's obedience many will be made righteous.<sup>84</sup>

The plain interpretation of St. Paul's use of Blood, as we have seen,<sup>85</sup> is the idea of death rather than life.

As Farrer comments:

In the New Testament the Blood of Christ is a ransom-price, a means of purging, the element to ratify a solemn covenant; but the explanation offered for all these ideas - the communication of life - is never stated, but has to be read in.<sup>86</sup>

In spite of all the efforts of an F.C.N. Hicks and an E.O. James, a Vincent Taylor and an L.S. Thornton<sup>87</sup> to demonstrate that in the New Testament Blood means not death but life, we have "no positive evidence for sacrifice having been so understood from the time of Leviticus to that of the New Testament."<sup>88</sup>

In fact, all the evidence is on the other side. It is not evidence offered to dispute the fact that Christ's death was interpreted as a sacrifice but rather to refute the claim that by "the blood of Christ" is meant his life rather than his sacrificial death. As one Pauline scholar writes:

We are not, of course, arguing that thoughts of sacrifice were absent from Paul's mind as he meditated on the death of Christ: that would be patently untrue. The fact that Paul regarded the cross as a sacrifice is not in dispute: the sense in which he so regarded it is the vital question. And the conclusion to which we are brought is this, that by sacrifice Paul means the utter self-abandonment and self-consecration of love. "I beseech you," he writes to the Romans, "that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice;" the principle there enunciated held good for all the sons of men, but in Christ alone had it been seen at work in full perfection. The obedience of His life, crowned by the self-oblation of His death - this was Christ's offering to God. This was His tribute of uttermost devotion. This was His "sacrifice." And to all who identified themselves with it, in faith and vital union, the blessedness of salvation was sure.<sup>89</sup>

A similar emphasis upon Jesus' obedience is characteristic of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In the days of His flesh, He brought prayers and supplications with passionate cries and tears to Him who was able to save Him from death, and because of His godliness He was heard. Thus, though Son, He learned obedience through the things He suffered, and being thereby perfected, He has become in His person the source of an eternal salvation for all who obey Him, with the title from God of 'High-Priest after the order of Melchizedek.'

Manson, the translator of this passage from Hebrews (5:7-10), comments that there can be no reasonable doubt that "for the writer the suffering, the prayers, and the cries of Jesus were part of the sacrificial Oblation by which the obedient Son of God became also for us the perfectly qualified Priest, the author of a salvation having the nature of eternity in it."<sup>90</sup> In Chapter III we will discuss the importance of this concept for a doctrine of the eternal sacrifice of Christ, but here it is sufficient to note that the vicarious suffering of Christ is spoken of in terms of his perfect obedience to the will of God.

Vincent Taylor, commenting on this theme in Hebrews, says "for the writer's purpose is not to assert that obedience is better than sacrifice, but to claim that, in that it fulfilled the will of God, Christ's sacrifice of Himself surpassed and superseded the

χαρίζομαι is used (2 Corinthians ii. 7, 10, xii. 13, Ephesians iv. 32, Colossians ii. 13, iii. 13), he uses the noun 'forgiveness' (ἄφεσις) twice only (Ephesians i. 7, Colossians i. 14) and the verb 'to forgive' (ἀφίημι) once in a quotation (Romans iv. 7). The explanation is that he regards forgiveness as the remission of sins, a gift of the grace of God especially associated with the salvation which Christ brings, but not the precise end for which He suffered. This purpose is much more intimately connected with justification and reconciliation."

<sup>101</sup>Hebrews 10:1-4.

<sup>102</sup>Manson, op. cit., 143.

<sup>103</sup>Ibid., 145.

<sup>104</sup>Hebrews 9:24-28. The translation is by Manson (op. cit., 139-40), the underlining is mine.

<sup>105</sup>Manson, op. cit., 141.

<sup>106</sup>Ibid., 141.

<sup>107</sup>Romans 5:18.

<sup>108</sup>Joachim Jeremias, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), 23.

<sup>109</sup>Taylor, op. cit., 129.

<sup>110</sup>Ibid., 129.

<sup>111</sup>Wolf, op. cit., 88.

<sup>112</sup>Manson, op. cit., 125.

<sup>113</sup>Ibid., 136.

<sup>114</sup>Taylor, op. cit., 23, 33, 42-3, 49, 51, 69. The point is well made in the following comment on the absence of eucharistic teaching in the Apocalypse (although I would regard the lack of a fully developed view of the Atonement in both I Peter and Revelation as being caused, at least in part, by their authors' eschatological hope: "The total absence of eucharistic teaching is due in part, as E.F. Scott (The Book of Revelation, p. 141.) has observed, to the fact that the seer is intent upon the idea of fulfilment; but the parallel absence of teaching regarding faith-union suggests, as in the case of I Peter, that the deeper reason is the relative simplicity of his

soteriology. Only as the sacrifice of Christ is more richly conceived, as a work of personal moment for sinful man and of decisive significance for the world to which he belongs, is the need felt for faith-union with the Redeemer and for a share in the rite in which His Presence and saving power are assured." (42-3)

## Chapter III.

THE NEW TESTAMENT BASIS FOR A DOCTRINE  
OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

## A.

## The Last Supper

The question as to whether the Last Supper can be said to have any connection with the idea of sacrifice must be answered in the affirmative.<sup>1</sup> A.E.J. Rawlinson in what Neville Clark calls "one of the truly seminal sentences in New Testament scholarship"<sup>2</sup> says: "The doctrine of sacrifice (and of atonement) was not... read into the Last Supper; it was read out of it. It was the Last Supper which afforded the clue."<sup>3</sup> This is not to suggest that we possess any certain knowledge as to what our Lord intended "in the night in which he was betrayed," but it is to suggest that the sacrificial significance of the Last Supper is clear in "both the manner and circumstances of the institution"<sup>4</sup> as recorded by the early Church.

'This is my body. This is the new covenant in my blood'. The broken bread, the poured out wine, were tied fast to Calvary; by word and action the mark of sacrifice was set indelibly upon the approaching death...<sup>5</sup>

Even as skeptical an inquirer as the New Testament scholar John Knox is forced to conclude that the words of Jesus in



the tradition recorded by St. Paul "clearly attribute a vicarious sacrificial significance to Christ's death,"<sup>6</sup> and that the simpler version in Jeremias' so-called "oldest form of the Words of Institution"<sup>7</sup> still presents "words strongly suggesting a sacrificial meaning."<sup>8</sup> "It has been maintained, writes Brilioth,"that the acts and words of Jesus at the Last Supper were intended to interpret his death as sacrificial; in any case they have been so understood by the church from the earliest days."<sup>9</sup>

Certainly no better authority for a sacrificial interpretation of the Last Supper needs to be produced, based as it is upon the primitive tradition recorded by Mark and St. Paul.<sup>10</sup> But that tradition is not in itself enough to establish a particular doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice. Although the Supper cannot be separated from its sacrificial associations without doing violence to the tradition, the precise meaning of this fact for eucharistic theology had to be gradually developed by the Church.

I want, therefore, to draw attention to one phrase in the Last Supper tradition which is of first importance for a doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice: 'blood of the covenant'. This concept, together with what Jeremias calls the Ausblick, "the eschatological looking forward,"<sup>11</sup> is, moreover, of special interest because it contains a possible key to our Lord's understanding of the meaning

of the Supper.

Scholars do not agree about such important matters as the identification of the Last Supper as a Passover<sup>12</sup> and Jesus' interpretation of his death as the vicarious suffering of the Servant,<sup>13</sup> but few if any of them would deny that the 'blood of the covenant' forms an integral part of the earliest form of the Last Supper tradition and is a reference to 'the poured out wine' of the solemn meal that Jesus ate with his disciples.<sup>14</sup> It is important to note that for a Palestinian Jew the matter of drinking blood, even symbolically, was unthinkable. The prohibition against such a thing was very ancient and of universal authority.<sup>15</sup> There is thus no greater proof of the revolutionary character of the Last Supper than the words: "This is my blood."

What exactly did these words mean? The ultimate answer to this question is not to be found in debating Jesus' foreknowledge of events but in the witness of the Church to his presence at their celebrations of the Eucharist.<sup>16</sup> However, we are given in the earliest form of the tradition an additional descriptive phrase 'of the covenant,' and this leads us into deeper comprehension of the meaning of the rite.<sup>17</sup>

We have seen that the Old Testament can be understood only in the context of the Covenant relationship

between Yahweh and his chosen people. The Covenant can be broken by man through sin, but God's persistent love is not thereby destroyed. The institution of sacrifice, which has created and sustained the Covenant relationship, witnesses to the fact that "wrath is not the ultimate truth about God."<sup>18</sup> And to all this the prophetic movement bears witness, proclaiming the retribution which must attend on man's failure to give perfect obedience to a righteous God, and at the same time expressing hope that the Covenant will survive, even though with the smallest Remnant, and will ultimately be renewed.

Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord. But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days saith the Lord; I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people: and they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more." (Jer. 31:31-4)

The application of this to the words 'blood of the covenant' at the Last Supper is obvious. It is made explicit in the formula handed down by St. Paul: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood."<sup>19</sup> One scholar

writes: "The key word to the whole tradition would appear to be the word διαθήκη."<sup>20</sup> Jeremias comments as follows:

With regard to the meaning of this expression, it has to be said that it intends to explain typologically the blood of the covenant poured out at Mount Sinai (Exod. 24.8, cf. Zech. 9.11), which (according to Targ. Onk. and Jerusch, J ad Exod. 24.8) had atoning power. As this blood established the covenant of Moses, so the blood of Jesus established the New Covenant (Jer. 31. 31-4, which had as its content the perfect fellowship with God (Jer. 31.33-34a), founded upon God's forgiveness (v. 34b), in His kingdom.<sup>21</sup>

How much of this can be said to have been in the mind of Christ at the Last Supper is not certain. However, the eschatological sayings at the end of the rite may provide the clue: "Truly, I say to you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until I drink it new in the kingdom of God."<sup>22</sup> Taken together, the ideas of the covenant blood of sacrifice and the inauguration of the eschatological order of redemption present the dramatic setting for the institution of the rite. Jesus, knowing that the crisis time has come, declares his obedience under God to whatever the future will bring and by anticipation binds his disciples with him in a new relationship, a relationship that is begun now but is to be consummated only as future event.<sup>23</sup>

Thus it was that Jesus, binding the last supper to the cross, bound also the

eucharist to Calvary, and set each and all in the context of sacrifice. By his own words and actions in the upper room that passover eve he ensured the interpretation of the eucharistic action in terms of the self-dedication to death which was his self-offering to the Father.<sup>24</sup>

## B. The Eternal Sacrifice

We must return now to the 'blood is the life' theme which I have argued played a much smaller role in New Testament thought than some scholars aver. This ancient Levitical precept emphasized the fact that it was not the victim's death, however necessary to the performance of the rite, but rather the manipulation of its blood which was the most significant part of animal sacrifice. It must now be shown that those who wish to take this understanding into the New Testament period perceive an important truth about the Gospel, even if they do not succeed in their exegesis of the term Blood.

The New Testament does not separate death and resurrection, atonement and redemption, as was done by some less discreet expressions of Calvinist doctrine; and if the main object of the sponsors of this view is to deny that the death can be taken by itself alone, then they are theologically right, though historically wrong in their interpretation of the New Testament term, Blood. But if they are attempting to identify blood with life simply, to the exclusion of the death through which it passed, they are theologically wrong too. It is indeed significant that the New Testament often does speak of the death alone,

even though the second aspect of life may always be taken to be implied."<sup>25</sup>

We must issue a caveat against the tendency in the 'blood is the life' school to make too close a comparison between what was done in Christ and the ceremonial of the Old Testament Sin Offering, thereby reducing the agony on the Cross to a mere stage in the Sacrifice of Christ.<sup>26</sup> F.C.N. Hicks makes this error when he writes "...the Cross is not itself the Sacrifice. It stands in its place - and that an essential place - in the whole course of the sacrificial action, but is not either its beginning or its end."<sup>27</sup> At the same time, it is important to insist with Hicks and others that the eternal Sacrifice begins in some sense at the Incarnation, and even before. The apparently contradictory nature of such a claim results from our failure to comprehend the meaning of the Cross as an event in time which reveals an eternal truth at the same time that it effects a unique result.<sup>28</sup> That is to say, the Cross is both sign and event. It symbolizes Christ's eternal self-offering to the Father, and it is the 'full, perfect, and sufficient' atonement in history 'for the sins of the whole world'.

The eternal nature of Christ's self-oblation is based upon the truth expressed by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in describing Christ as "the

same yesterday, today, and for ever."<sup>29</sup> Manson interprets this to mean "In Jesus Christ eternity is manifested in time."<sup>30</sup> It is a teaching to which the Church has given corporate witness through the ages: "As it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, world without end." Thus Atonement and Incarnation cannot be completely separated. They are both based upon our Lord's obedience to the Father's will, an obedience which in life on this earth found its perfect consummation in his death upon the Cross.

W.J.S. Simpson reminds us that "One of the primary distinctions of the Christian Revelation is that it is essentially concerned with fundamental distinctions within the inner life of the one eternal Deity."<sup>31</sup> Thus the self-oblation of the Incarnate One must reveal something about the nature of the eternal Trinity.

The Sacrificial Spirit did not begin upon the Cross. It was already revealed in the Incarnation. And the spirit of Sacrifice existed ages before the Incarnation. It arose in Eternity. It existed in the heart of the Father before the creation of man. In the counsels of Eternity its accomplishment was resolved by the mutual sacrifice made by the Eternal Father and His Eternal Son.<sup>32</sup>

What, we may ask, is the distinguishing characteristic of this 'sacrificial spirit' in the Godhead? In the great passage Philippians 2:5f. St. Paul speaks of the Redeemer's sacrifice in terms of a pre-incarnate renunciation. The Incarnation is on this view the

measure of the Son's obedience to the will of the Father.<sup>33</sup> But surely the author of the Fourth Gospel is right in his insistence that the ground of the eternal relationship of the Father and the Son is the dimension of divine Love. We are much in debt to the Archbishop of York for his application of this truth to the concept of sacrifice in the deity:

"A priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek," the Son of God for ever possesses the character of one who gives His life utterly in love. His eternal priesthood and sacrifice are the eternal element of self-giving love in the God-head, the element which S. John describes as the eternal love of the Son for the Father and of the Father for the Son.<sup>34</sup>

This understanding of the eternal Sacrifice must not, however, detract in any way from the all-sufficiency and supreme meritoriousness of the Cross. If the Sacrifice comprehends the eternal life of the Son as well as his Incarnation and Atonement, it is nevertheless true that "the death [at a specific point in history] is the mark and the significant fact about the life, making it forever 'the life whereof the abiding characteristic is to have died'."<sup>35</sup> Anything less than this fails to do justice to the plain New Testament belief in the cruciality of the Cross. St. Paul writes "we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son;"<sup>36</sup> the author of I Peter says that "Christ also died for sins once for all;"<sup>37</sup> and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews avows that "without the



shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins."<sup>38</sup>

"But," writes Bishop Aulen, "just as emphatically as the New Testament declares that the earthly ministry of Christ is definitive, it also testifies that his redemptive work still continued."<sup>39</sup> The author of Hebrews says that Christ "is able for all time to save those who draw near to God through him, since he always lives to make intercession for them."<sup>40</sup>

There is a connecting link between this thought and the New Testament concept of the Church as the Body of Christ. It is the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice. Never explicitly stated in the New Testament writings, it alone, as the Church gradually came to realize, perfectly expresses the meaning that the New Testament authors are moving toward. On the one hand is their sure conviction that the Christ who sits at the right hand of the Father is inseparably united with his Church. As Aulen says, "...the ascension does not involve a separation. The ascended and glorified Lord does not cease to live in fellowship with those for whom he gave his life."<sup>41</sup> On the other hand is the Epistle to the Hebrews' teaching about the heavenly High Priesthood of Christ. We have only to combine these two concepts to arrive at what I regard as the implicit New Testament understanding of the sacrificial

aspect of the Eucharist: the Sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist is the sacramental presence of Himself - as Crucified, Resurrected and Ascended Lord - for the exercise of his eternal Priesthood in terms of intercession and reconciliation (oblation) and to impart his Life to the members of his Body the Church (communion).

With the idea of the Church as the Body of Christ we will be dealing in the next section. Here we must focus on the exposition of the heavenly high priesthood of Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews. For the great theme of that Epistle is the representation of our Lord as the One perfect High Priest whose function abides forever.

In discussing the Last Supper tradition, it was emphasized that whatever else it may have meant, "blood of the covenant" would have suggested that a new relationship was to be inaugurated on the basis of Jesus' self-offering in obedience to the will and purpose of God. The author of Hebrews declares this new relationship begun and explains his meaning by an analogy between the work of Christ and the superseded sacrificial cultus of the old covenant.

On the Day of Atonement, the high priest, acting on behalf of himself and the people, brought the blood of sacrifice into the holy of holies at the high point of the solemn annual rite. The death of the animal victim

was only the necessary prelude to the crowning act of consecrating and presenting its blood to Yahweh. Hebrews presents Christ as the true High Priest. He has fulfilled all that the sacrifices of the old covenant merely foreshadowed. His vicarious suffering is the perfect sacrifice of surpassing worth, and with his blood he has entered the sanctuary in heaven, "now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf."<sup>42</sup> The whole argument leads up to this intercessory ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.

Now the point in what we are saying is this: we have such a high priest, one who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, a minister in the sanctuary and the true tent which is set up not by man but by the Lord.<sup>43</sup>

The author of Hebrews does not question the truth of his analogy.<sup>44</sup> We have had occasion to remark that the inadequacy of the cultus was not, on his view, due to its being a sacrificial system.<sup>45</sup> It was due rather to the imperfection of that system as a means of abolishing the guilt of sin, man's knowledge of his infinite separation from the high and holy God.

This separation is pictured as ended in the High Priestly work of Christ, whose life of suffering in complete identification with mankind and culminating in his death has now by the merits of that vicarious sacrifice made possible our worshipped approach to God

through him.<sup>46</sup>

It is important to note that what has happened in Christ is for the author of Hebrews an entirely new thing. The work of Christ has not only fulfilled the inner purpose of the sacrificial system, it has perfected and sublimated it. The author of Hebrews, as one scholar puts it, "does not argue that Christ is simply the perfect Jewish high priest writ large."<sup>47</sup>

Manson comments:

The finality of the Christian revelation is marked not by its temporal incidence alone, but by the transcendent character of the Person, the rank, the status, and the authority of Him through whom and in whom it comes. Here is not a prophet but a Son [Heb. 1:1-2], who as the Messiah of God is the Lord of history, the divinely appointed Inheritor of the ages.<sup>48</sup>

Mention of His divine appointment puts us in touch with the eternal character of Christ's sacrifice, the theme with which this section has chiefly been concerned. The author of Hebrews bases the High Priestly role upon the One oblation, but he sees eternal truth in this asseveration. The work of Christ was appointed in eternity, perfected in time, and continues until the near-approaching end of the age. The sacrifice of the Cross was made once-for-all; the work of intercession, made possible by that sacrifice, continues forever. Both are manifestations of the eternal obedience of the Son of God. The thought is best expressed in the author's dramatic application of a prophetic passage

from Psalm 40 to the Incarnation of the Redeemer: "Then I said, 'Lo, I have come to do thy will, O God', as it is written of me in the roll of the book."<sup>49</sup>

The passage brings out very clearly the continuity of the pre-existent life of Jesus with His Incarnate life, and the continuity in turn of the Incarnation with His heavenly life. He assumed manhood to fulfil a purpose declared in eternity, offering Himself to God 'through the eternal Spirit', and now in eternity He presents the result of that finished work.<sup>50</sup>

Elsewhere in the New Testament allusion is made to the heavenly intercession of Christ on behalf of the Church,<sup>51</sup> but only in Hebrews do we find the concept of an eternal oblation which reaches a climax in the life and death of the Incarnate Son in history and thereby issues in a continuous intercession on behalf of sinful men. It is a powerful theme, but although it richly conceives the cosmic character of the drama of redemption, it does not explain "how that self-offering becomes a vital reality in the experience of believers."<sup>52</sup> It has been argued above that the reason for this is the radical eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.<sup>53</sup> In any case, it is necessary to look elsewhere for an explanation of how the believer can participate in the eternal Sacrifice of Christ.

### C. The Body of Christ

It is the purpose of this section to suggest that the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ provides the key to this problem of the Christians participation in the divine self-offering, and that when taken in conjunction with the Hebrews theme, it offers a sound New Testament basis for the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice.

For St. Paul, as one New Testament scholar says, "it is instinctive to relate the event on Calvary immediately to the inward and personal experience of the Christian."<sup>54</sup> Thus, to be baptized into Christ is to be baptized into his death,<sup>55</sup> and if we thus share in his death we will be inheritors of his resurrection.<sup>56</sup> Moreover, the salvation of the individual is tied to the corporate destiny: "You are all one man in Christ Jesus."<sup>57</sup> "We are convinced that one has died for all; therefore all have died."<sup>58</sup> This concept of Christian solidarity is based upon the Pauline doctrine of the Body.

Paul writes to the Church at Corinth: "Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ?"<sup>59</sup> A modern might suppose that what he has in mind is some sort of organizational or spiritual unity. But J.A.T. Robinson, in his study of the Pauline doctrine of the Body, says that "The force of Paul's words can to-day

perhaps be got only by paraphrasing: 'Ye are the body of Christ and severally membranes thereof' (I Cor. 12.27). The body that he has in mind is as concrete and as singular as the body of the Incarnation."<sup>60</sup>

The extremely physical or literal nature of the relation of Christians comes out particularly in the discussion on marriage. A Christian husband or wife can make his or her partner Christian.<sup>61</sup> Indeed, and this is perhaps the most difficult teaching of all, "The body of his flesh is so related to his Body the Church that the Church's afflictions are the implementing of his passion under Pontius Pilate."<sup>62</sup>

Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I complete what is lacking in Christ's afflictions for the sake of his body, that is, the church.<sup>63</sup>

How can all this be? How is it possible for Paul to speak of Christians being "reconciled in his (Christ's) body of flesh by his death" and at the same time of the Church as the resurrection body of the Lord? The answer is to be found in the fact that Paul is not employing metaphor but is deliberately using realistic terms that do not make sense until they are viewed in the context of his eucharistic teaching: "Because there is one loaf, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the same loaf."<sup>65</sup> The unity of the Church is thus based upon the eucharistic bread, a unity in

corporeal terms inexplicable apart from the Lord's assertion "This is my body." Clark writes:

Thus the pattern falls into place, of last supper, cross, and eucharist; the one Christ, the one body, the one sacrifice throughout. And thus, in partaking of the one bread which is his body, the Church becomes in truth the body of Christ, the σῶμα Χριστοῦ.<sup>66</sup>

The New Testament makes no attempt to give a metaphysical definition of this Real Presence, but the Pauline doctrine of the Body indicates that the Presence is to be thought of as objective and real, though of course in the sense of sacramental signification rather than crude materialism.<sup>67</sup> Moreover, it is the presence of the Christ, who, in matchless love and obedience, became incarnate, suffered, died, and ascended to heaven on our behalf. The two traditional problems with regard to the Sacrament of the Altar, the sacrificial motif and the nature of our Lord's sacramental presence, are to be associated together and resolved - insofar as human minds can define what is essentially a mystery - in terms of the assertion that the presence of Christ in the Sacrament means the effective presence of his Sacrifice.

Mention of the key problems in eucharistic theology takes us beyond the New Testament development, and further comment on such matters will be reserved for the Conclusion. Here it is only necessary to sum up the New Testament



teaching by referring back to the definition of eucharistic sacrifice given on page 78: the Sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist is the sacramental presence of Himself - as Crucified, Resurrected and Ascended Lord - for the exercise of his eternal Priesthood in terms of intercession and reconciliation (oblation) and to impart his Life to the members of his Body the Church (communion). The heavenly oblation of Christ is taught by the author of Hebrews, but he does not tell us how we are to participate in the divine self-offering. St. Paul's teaching about the Body of Christ means that "...sacramental communion is a sharing in all that He has accomplished in His death, as well as fellowship with Himself."<sup>68</sup> Combined, these two concepts give us the authentic New Testament basis for a doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice: the oblation of Christ and our communion with Him. When the Church later asserted that the heavenly oblation and the communion were one in the Eucharist, she was merely uniting the rich deposits of New Testament thought about Christ and his identification with the Church. To see that in Him was the perfect offering of obedience and love to the Father, was to know that the One who has designated a meeting place with the people of the new covenant would there, under the forms of bread and wine, take up their imperfect offerings into His own.

## Notes for Chapter Three

<sup>1</sup>"Does the Lord's Supper in the New Testament have any connection with the idea of sacrifice? We need hardly ask this question. It is obvious that it must be answered in the affirmative. The event which the narratives of the institution of the Supper describe and the interpretive words they record are sufficient evidence. The words 'given for you', 'shed for you', interpret both the event at the table and the act of sacrifice in death. The sacrifice is an inseparable and integral part of the Lord's Supper." (Gustaf Aulen, Eucharist and Sacrifice [Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958], 139.)

<sup>2</sup>Neville Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1958), 63.

<sup>3</sup>A.E.J. Rawlinson, "Corpus Christi," Bell and Deissmann (Ed.s), Mysterium Christi, Christological Studies by British and German Theologians (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930), 241.

<sup>4</sup>E.J. Bicknell, A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955), 411.

<sup>5</sup>Clark, op. cit., 63.

<sup>6</sup>John Knox, The Death of Christ (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958), 48.

<sup>7</sup>Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 106f.

<sup>8</sup>Knox, op. cit., 48.

<sup>9</sup>Yngve Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice (London: S.P.C.K., 1953), 283.

<sup>10</sup>The results of objective inquiry into the historicity of this tradition do not provide any stumbling blocks to faith in its essential integrity. Thus we have the impressive scholarship of Jeremias to back up this conclusion:

"Of the traditions which have come down to us, Mark's is the nearest to the primitive Aramaic account of the Last Supper... His wording is therefore earlier than the development and enlargement of the Aramaic original of

the account of the Last Supper, which took place long before A.D. 49/50, the results of which are to be found in Paul.

"That in the remaining space of at most a decade<sup>1</sup> [1 "If it is correct to say that Paul reproduces the words of institution in the form used by the Church at Antioch (cf. p. 131), the time must have been shorter still."] after the death of Jesus the Eucharistic rite should have been freely created, and the account of the Lord's Supper invented as an aetiological legend, in as much incapable of proof as it is improbable. It is even improbable that in the first decade after the death of Jesus the tradition should be in any essentials obscured; against that we have to set the complete unanimity in content of the mutually independent reports of Mark and Paul which came from different sections of the Church. Since the tradition of Mark besides its material indications of a very early age, possesses a further guarantee of trustworthiness in its Palestinian origin (Semitisms), we have every reason to conclude that it gives us absolutely authentic information." (op. cit., 132.)

<sup>11</sup>Jeremias, op. cit., 115.

<sup>12</sup>This is one of the most complicated of all New Testament problems. The Synoptics say that the Last Supper was held on 'The first day of unleavened bread' (Matt. 26:17; cf. Mark 14:12, Luke 22:7) and therefore that the Last Supper was the Passover meal. The Fourth Gospel puts it a day earlier 'before the feast of the passover' (13:1; cf. 19:14) which would make Jesus' death on the Cross coincide with the time that the lambs were being sacrificed at the Temple. It has often been argued that St. John's timing is artificially made to fit this idea. On the other hand, if this is true it is strange that he does not exploit the point as one would expect him to do if he were deliberately changing the time for dramatic effect.

After discussing several difficulties in the way of accepting the view that the Last Supper was a Passover, Sherman Johnson comes to what I regard as the most satisfactory view of the problem: "It is possible to fit the account of the Last Supper into the framework of a Passover, if one accepts the tradition in this section [14:12-16] that such careful preparations were made. The hymn at the end could have been one of the Hallel psalms, and it is possible to use the word ἄρτος in referring to the massoth or unleavened bread; cf. J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (Oxford and New York, 1955), op. cit., 14-57. But the account does not itself demand this, and there is no mention of the

lamb, the bitter herbs, or the massoth as such. The notion that the Last Supper was a kiddush or preparatory meal celebrated the day before Passover has been adequately disposed of by Jeremias (pp. 24f.). Perhaps more is to be said for the theory that this was a solemn meal of a haburah or religious fellowship; cf. F.L. Cirlot, The Early Eucharist (London, 1939), pp. 1-16, and literature there cited. Such a meal might take place at any time of the year." (A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark [New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960], 226-7.) It has been argued recently that the Last Supper was an irregular Passover celebrated a day or two before the date laid down by the Pharisees. Cf. A.H. Hunter, "Recent Trends in Johannine Studies," The Expository Times, LXXI (April, 1960), 221.; Basil Minchin, Covenant and Sacrifice (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958), 50f.

At any rate, the Last Supper was held at the time of the annual Passover feast, and the important point for the argument developed in the body of the thesis at this point is that every Jew would have in his mind the thought of the deliverance from Egypt, with which is associated the covenant of Exodus 24.

<sup>13</sup> Much scholarly debate centers on the question of Jesus' self-interpretation. Of key importance is the Servant Concept and Jesus' use of the title Son of Man. W. Manson argues that the concepts Son of Man and Servant of the Lord are related, in the sense that the Son of Man came as a servant: "He who is called to be the Messiah Son of God sees the way marked out for Him by the practice of the Servant and teaches that only through the humiliation and self-sacrifice of the Servant is the glory of the Son of Man to be attained." (Jesus the Messiah [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1952], LII.) Scholars are not at all agreed as to the connection which Manson suggests. It was certainly made by the evangelists; in Jesus' own thinking, perhaps; but in earlier thought?

Some scholars go so far as to deny even that Jesus used the term Son of Man (which is never used by anyone but Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, where it appears about seventy times). Branscomb attributes the title to the early Church (The Gospel of Mark [New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957], 146f.), but if this is true, it was only the very early Church, since Paul et.al. do not use it.

It does seem unlikely that Jesus used the title Son of Man with reference to himself in any traditional (apocalyptic) sense, but it is not necessary to argue on

this basis that he did not use the title at all. "Whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this sinful and adulterous generation, the Son of man will also be ashamed of him when he comes..." (Mk. 8:38). Here there seems to be a contrast between Jesus and the Son of Man. (Cf. Mk. 13:26, Mt. 10:23, Lk. 12:40, Lk. 17:22-37.) He may also have used the term as a personal designation to express what he believed concerning his person and work. Vincent Taylor points out that it appears "in several of the sayings with a present and personal significance" (The Names of Jesus [London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1954], 34. Their eschatological note should also be emphasized: "...the Son of man has authority on earth to forgive sins..." (Mk. 2:10)

<sup>14</sup>"Mark/Matthew - the wine 'is my blood of the covenant'; Paul/Luke - the wine 'is the new covenant by (causal & /) my blood," both compare the wine with the blood, the outpouring of which is the basis for the establishment of the new covenant." Jeremias, op. cit., 112.

<sup>15</sup>Supra, Chap. II, n. 28.

<sup>16</sup>See Walter Lowrie's account of the 'Tradition of the Upper Room' in his Action in the Liturgy (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953), 11-12. The problem is similar to that presented by the debate over the command to repeat the rite. Jeremias says "This command also is not likely to be part of the original formula, because its insertion is more easily explained than its omission." (op. cit., 110.) However, Vincent Taylor argues that "To say that St. Paul has made explicit what was already implicit, is greatly facilitated because we know the events which followed the death of Jesus. Can we be certain that the idea of repetition would have been found to be implicit, if Jesus had not said: 'Do this in remembrance of me'?" (Jesus and His Sacrifice [London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1955], 208.) Neither argument can be finally proved. The crucial point is that the rite was repeated. John Knox writes: "...criticism may demonstrate that they (alleged words of Jesus) were not first spoken during the historical career of Jesus [In this case, criticism can at most suggest the possibility.] but it cannot place them outside the limits of the event which instituted that career but also much more, and with which alone the New Testament is really concerned." (Criticism and Faith [New York: Abingdon, 1952], 54.)

<sup>17</sup>It should be noted that although Jeremias follows Dalman and Bultmann in speculating as to whether this is an early exegetical gloss, he does not deny the possibility that the word "covenant" may represent Jesus' own idea, and indeed he concludes that "it is highly probable" that this is so because "the promise of Jer. 31.31 sq. was highly popular in his days, as is seen from the writing of the community of the new covenant at Damascus." (op. cit., 135, 75.)

<sup>18</sup>J.S. Whale, Victor and Victim (Cambridge: The University Press, 1960), 49.

<sup>19</sup>Jeremias is probably correct in asserting that καὶ νῦν was a later addition. (op. cit., 128.)

<sup>20</sup>John O. Cobham, "The Sacrifice of the New Covenant," The Parish Communion (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), 57.

<sup>21</sup>Jeremias, op. cit., 134.

<sup>22</sup>Mark 14:25; Cf. Matt. 26:29, Luke 22:15-18, and Pauline analogy in I Cor. 11:26. For a discussion of their place in the tradition see Jeremias, op. cit., 115-118.

<sup>23</sup>So strong was the eschatological emphasis that, as Vincent Taylor points out, "the references to breaking bread in the Acts (ii. 42; cf. ii. 46, xx. 7, 11, xxvii. 35), may indicate communion-meals which pointed forward to the Parousia rather than eucharistic fellowship associated with the death of Christ." (The Atonement in New Testament Teaching [London: The Epworth Press, 1954], 69.)

<sup>24</sup>Clark, op. cit., 64.

<sup>25</sup>Austin M. Farrer, "Eucharist and Church in the New Testament," The Parish Communion (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), 90.

<sup>26</sup>"In our study of the New Testament we have noted the comparatively small extent to which the meaning of the death of Christ is assimilated to that of the sacrifices of the Levitical cultus." (Vincent Taylor, Atonement, op. cit., 186.)

"...the acts which make up the complete drama of Sacrifice follow the same order in the Old and New Covenants. We shall see how the ceremonial acts described

in Chapter III are repeated in the same order, no longer as ceremonial symbols, but as actual realities, in the Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Jesus Christ and through the Eucharist in His Body, the Church." (S.C. Gayford, Sacrifice and Priesthood [London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1953], 126, 144f.) Cf. Cobham, op. cit., 59f.

<sup>27</sup>F.C.N. Hicks, The Fullness of Sacrifice (3rd ed.; London: S.P.C.K., 1946), 240. Hicks' moving description of Christ's whole mission in terms of temple sacrifice, must not lead us into a betrayal of the plain New Testament assertion of the "once for all" sacrifice of the Cross:

"The approach and the identification are blended in the Incarnation: in the picture of the prodigal son drawing near to his father's home, and the Good Shepherd returning with the lost sheep. The sinners slay the victim: the High Priest Caiaphas, who took the lead in bringing Him to the Cross, prophesied, in the sense of speaking more truly than he knew, when he said that it was expedient that one man should die for the people. He who is both Victim and High Priest passes with His blood - the life of man, now released from its exile in the far country of his sins - through the Veil, the torn and broken body of the limited life in which we dwell apart from God, into God's presence in the Heavenly Sanctuary. There He pleads, intercedes, atones. His Body - the human nature which He came to redeem and to dedicate in the doing of God's will - is offered in its perfect obedience, and transformed by the Spirit, in Resurrection, Ascension, and Session, into the body of His glory: it is freed from the limitations of its earthly life, when it was the body of His humiliation, and becomes spiritual and heavenly. It is only so that it can henceforth exist, or be known, in heaven or in earth. And, in the end, He gives His new manhood to His own in the gifts of His new Body and of His blood which is His and their eternal life.

"That and nothing else, is His Sacrifice. Not the Atonement only, however we may define that, but the Incarnation also, in the fullness of its meaning, belong to it in all its stages. The Sacrifice is not the Death alone; nor the pleading with the blood alone; nor the offering upon the altar 'in heaven'; nor the act of Communion alone. Later language may speak of the Death as sacrifice, or of the offering; and in the limitations of speech and of thought such words may be allowed. But it would be equally accurate to call our Lord's coming into the world and His earthly life, or



the communion feast, sacrifice. We do not, it is true, commonly so speak of them. Each stage is sacrificial. All together make the One Sacrifice." (250-251)

<sup>28</sup>In Chapter II (Supra., p.39 ) we saw that for the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews Christ's self-oblation on the Cross 'is an offering that never needs to be repeated (in history) and yet one that in its eternal aspect has never ceased to be'.

<sup>29</sup>Hebrews 13:8.

<sup>30</sup>William Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951), 187.

<sup>31</sup>W.J. Sparrow Simpson, The Religion of Sacrifice (London:S.P.C.K., 1947), 5.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., 37.

<sup>33</sup>"Existing in heaven, he voluntarily submits to the conditions of human life upon earth (the form of a slave), and in the fullness of obedience even enters the realm of death." (F.W. Beare, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians [New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959], 78.)

<sup>34</sup>Arthur Michael Ramsey, The Gospel and the Catholic Church (2nd ed.; London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1956), 114.

The idea that sacrifice has its origin in the being of God Himself, though thoroughly Biblical, has not been given the attention it deserves from professional theologians. It is, I believe, the key to an understanding of the Christian Sacrifice in its fullness. F.D. Maurice, who was in many respects a nineteenth century prophet, has this magnificent passage in his volume of sermons entitled The Doctrine of Sacrifice (London: Macmillan and Co., 1879): "It is for this reason, I conceive, that the apostles [His text is I Peter 1:18-20.], when they dwell so continually upon the effects of the divine and human sacrifice in taking away sin and utterly removing all the effects of it, yet lead us back to a ground of sacrifice in the divine nature; in that submission of the Son to the Father, that perfect unity of Purpose, Will, Substance, between them, whence the obedience and fellowship of all unfallen beings, the obedience and fellowship of all restored beings, must be derived, and by which they are sustained." (109) Ramsey expresses



his (and our) debt to Maurice in these words: "The Doctrine of Sacrifice brought back the unity of atonement and creation; it linked together the idea of sacrifice and the doctrine of the Trinity; it gave to many their first glimpse of the classic conception of the Cross as the divine victory. In our own day Aulen's exposition of the classic conception, Vincent Taylor's demonstration of the centrality of the idea of sacrifice in the New Testament, Quick's synthesis of the classic conception and the idea of sacrifice, have done, by more scientific theological methods, what Maurice did intuitively and naïvely with a pre-critical technique of Bible exposition." (A.M. Ramsey, F.D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology [Cambridge: The University Press, 1951], 68-69.)

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., 114.

<sup>36</sup>Romans 5:10.

<sup>37</sup>I Peter 3:18.

<sup>38</sup>Hebrews 9:22. "No explanation is offered why the sanctification of the worshipper, the removal of his guilt, the expiation of his sin, the atonement of his soul to God should be made dependent on the blood of sacrifice. That necessity is assumed. It is something given. It is a thing inseparable from the age-long history of grace in Israel, and the writer of this Epistle, who, like a multitude of others, had found his own approach to God so prescribed and who had come along this path to the foot of the Cross, does not feel it incumbent upon him to argue its sufficiency." (Manson, op. cit., 134-5.)

<sup>39</sup>Aulen, op. cit., 122.

"...the Redemption which Christ won for us on the Cross is a 'finished work' in that it cannot be repeated within the order of history, but... at the same time the effects of that Redemption have to be applied to every individual soul in each succeeding generation." (E.L. Kendall, A Living Sacrifice [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960], 24.)

<sup>40</sup>Hebrews 7:25.

<sup>41</sup>Aulen, op. cit., 150.

<sup>42</sup>Hebrews 9:24b.

<sup>43</sup>Hebrews 8:1-2.

<sup>44</sup>"...for both the writer and the readers of Hebrews the doctrine of the Priesthood and Oblation of Christ was of the givenness and very essence of the received Christian faith." (Manson, op. cit., 7.) Supra, n. 38.

<sup>45</sup>Supra, p. 38.

<sup>46</sup>Hebrews 10:19-24.

<sup>47</sup>William J. Wolf, No Cross No Crown (Garden City; N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1957), 41.

<sup>48</sup>Manson, op. cit., 89.

<sup>49</sup>Hebrews 9:7.

<sup>50</sup>Manson, op. cit., 145. It must be emphasized that the eternal Sacrifice in terms of the self-offering of the Son to the Father before the Incarnation is to be sharply distinguished from the intercessory oblation of the Ascended Christ. Although the principle of sacrifice as self-offering in loving obedience remains the same, the Atonement in history is crucial for man's redemption. Thus Aulen: "As High Priest Christ has entered into the Holy Place. He brought that sacrifice of reconciliation which was made once for all and which implied an eternal redemption. That he remains a high priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek does not mean that he continually repeats the sacrifice he made during his earthly life. It means rather that this sacrifice made once for all is eternally valid." (Aulen, op. cit., 152. The underlining is mine.)

<sup>51</sup>"who is to condemn? Is it Christ Jesus, who died, yes, who was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us?" (Romans 8:34.) Elsewhere (Romans 8:27) Paul refers to the Spirit's intercession "for the saints according to the will of God."

"My little children, I am writing this to you so that you may not sin; but if any one does sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." (I John 2:1)

<sup>52</sup>V. Taylor, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching, op. cit., 161f. On the vexed question of the interpretation of Hebrews 13:10f. ("We have an altar...") I follow Manson in believing that no reference to the Christian Eucharist is intended. (Manson, op. cit., 149f.)

<sup>53</sup>Supra, p. 41-2.

<sup>54</sup>Manson, op. cit., 154.

<sup>55</sup>Romans 6:3.

<sup>56</sup>Romans 6:5.

<sup>57</sup>Gal. 3:28.

<sup>58</sup>II Cor. 5:14.

<sup>59</sup>I Cor. 6:15.

<sup>60</sup>John A.T. Robinson, The Body, 'A Study in Pauline Theology' (Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, 1955), 51.

Thus L.S. Thornton writes: "We are members of that body which was nailed to the Cross, laid in the tomb and raised to life on the third day. There is only one organism of the new creation; and we are members of that one organism which is Christ." (L.S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ [Westminster: Dacre Press, 1946], 298.)

<sup>61</sup>"For the unbelieving husband is consecrated through his wife, and the unbelieving wife is consecrated through her husband." (I Corinthians 7:14)

<sup>62</sup>C.F.D. Moule, The Sacrifice of Christ (Greenwich: The Seabury Press, 1957), 42.

<sup>63</sup>Colossians 1:24.

<sup>64</sup>Colossians 1:21-2.

<sup>65</sup>I Corinthians 10:17. Robinson (op. cit., 55-7.) lists the five main sources that have been suggested as explanations for the origin of Paul's doctrine of the Body of Christ:

1. Stoic ideas
2. Gnostic ideas
3. The O.T. concept of Corporate Personality
4. The Christian Eucharist
5. Rabbinic Speculation on the body of Adam

"There can be little doubt that the form in which he (Paul) chose to express himself was on occasion influenced by several if not by all of these sources." However, Robinson gives special emphasis to two of these: the Eucharist

and Paul's experience on Damascus road ("Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Acts 26:14f.; 9:4f.; 22:7f.). The latter theory, which is Robinson's own addition to the list of five, is highly questionable because criticism has effectively called the historicity of the Acts story of Paul's conversion into doubt. (See John Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul [Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950], 113f.)

Of the other theories, the most convincing (with the exception of the Eucharist, which I follow Robinson in regarding as primary) is that of Rabbinic Speculations on the body of Adam, championed by W.D. Davies in his important book Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: S.P.C.K., 1948), 55-7. "Paul accepted the traditional Rabbinic doctrine of the unity of mankind in Adam. That doctrine implied that the very constitution of the physical body of Adam and the method of its formation was symbolic of the real oneness of mankind. In that one body of Adam east and west, north and south were brought together, male and female, as we have seen. The 'body' of Adam included all mankind. Was it not natural, then, that Paul when he thought of the new humanity being incorporated 'in Christ' should have conceived of it as the 'body' of the Second Adam, where there was neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, bond nor free. The difference between the Body of the First Adam and that of the Second Adam was for Paul that whereas the former was animated by the principle of natural life, was nephesh, the latter was animated by the Spirit. Entry upon the Christian life is for the Apostle the putting off of the old man with his deeds and the putting on of the new man. The purpose of God in Christ is "in the dispensation of the fullness of times" "to gather together in one all things in Christ," i.e. the reconstitution of the essential oneness of mankind in Christ as a spiritual community, as it was one in Adam in a physical sense." (57)

A.E.J. Rawlinson, in his essay 'Corpus Christi', comments:

"The unity, in other words, of the Church is for St. Paul not simply a 'spiritual' unity: it is at the same time a 'bodily' unity. The phrase 'the unity of the spirit', for example, in the sense in which it is used in the Epistle to the Ephesians, does not mean 'unity of spirit' in the modern sense, as a conception which might stand in conceivable contrast with 'unity of body': it means 'the oneness of the Spirit', considered not as in contrast with the oneness of the Body, but as its complement. There is one Body, and correspondingly there is one Spirit. The unity of the Church is for

St. Paul not 'spiritual' as contrasted with 'bodily'; it is 'bodily'." (Rawlinson, op. cit., 231.)

<sup>66</sup>Clark, op. cit., 67-8.

A possible interpretation of Col. 1:24 is thus the mystical conception of A.R. George, who says "Paul does not mean merely that the Christian experiences the sufferings of Christ after Him in thought, imagination, or sympathy, nor merely that his own actual sufferings are endured with Christ or for the sake of Christ (though all these ideas are present), but that his own actual sufferings are a real participation in Christ's sufferings, suffered by virtue of his communion with Christ." (Communion with God in the NT. [London: Epworth Press, 1953], 184.)

<sup>67</sup>This is the meaning of John 6:63 ("It is the Spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail.") In the concluding verses of the preceding discourse the author of the Fourth Gospel makes clear his belief in the real and objective Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. As A.J.B. Higgins observes: "The necessity of eating the flesh of the Son of Man is driven home uncompromisingly by the transition to the word 'munch'...for 'eat' in verses 54, 56-58. It is a real eating that is meant. The Christ at the Eucharist is as real as was his human body." (The Lord's Supper in the New Testament [London: S.C.M., 1956], 82.)

<sup>68</sup>Taylor, op. cit., 201.

## Chapter IV.

### CONCLUSION

#### A.

#### A View from Early Tradition

If Chapters II and III have demonstrated that only in the light of Old Testament faith is it possible to understand the New Testament period, it is no less true that the Fathers cannot be studied without reference to the civilization of which they were a part. The first six centuries A.D. was a time of real struggle on the part of Greek and Latin Christians to interpret the Gospel in the light of their inherited classical world view.

It is therefore highly doubtful that the traditional catena patrum can establish 'the mind of the Early Church' on the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice. The most even a well-annotated list of excerpts from the Fathers can do is demonstrate that common language was used or that some ideas and concepts appear to be present throughout. In order to establish the relative importance of any of these ideas in the thinking of an individual writer, a detailed analysis of his total thought is necessary.

Such analysis goes beyond the limits of the present study. St. Irenaeus, who has been selected for comment here, will be used primarily as a means of underlining the general problem and to suggest the kind of development that took place in the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice during the early Period.

Irenaeus was a Greek Father of the second century. It might seem more reasonable to use the third century Latin bishop of Carthage, St. Cyprian, as a representative of the early period. Cyprian was, in the words of Dom Gregory Dix, the "most influential propagator" of the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice in the Ante-Nicene period.<sup>1</sup> However, Irenaeus stands closer to the New Testament period, and his less clearly formulated doctrine is perhaps more typical of the early Fathers.

Irenaeus was the chief patristic writer on the Gnostics.<sup>2</sup> He lived and worked in Gaul at the capital city of Lyons, but he was a native of Asia Minor and thoroughly Greek.<sup>3</sup> His chief work is the Adversus Haereses, "Against Heresies." For Irenaeus the chief question with regard to human redemption is how incorruption is said to be conferred upon the body. The question as well as the way he answers it, reveals his Hellenistic philosophical orientation.<sup>4</sup> It is therefore necessary to agree with Bouisset that the

Eucharist does not play a very large role in Irenaeus' thought.<sup>5</sup> It is seldom mentioned, and, as one might expect, the anti-Gnostic tone of passages in which it does appear is pronounced. This is not to say that the Eucharist is primarily for Irenaeus an anti-Gnostic apologetic tool, although that may be the explanation of his famous "first-fruits" motif.<sup>6</sup> Nor is it to suggest that we should disregard his comments about the Eucharist when he does make them. It means that there is no eucharistic doctrine per se in Irenaeus' writings. Sacrifice was a part of the pagan world around him, and the Liturgy a part of the Christian tradition he had received, and it was inevitable that he should use words like sacrifice and oblation in connection with the Eucharist. The question is in what sense he used them,<sup>7</sup> and because the Sacrament was less than central to his thought, we cannot give a completely satisfactory answer to that question. The following three texts are commonly cited:

The oblation of the Church, therefore, which the Lord gave instructions to be offered throughout all the world, is accounted with God a pure sacrifice, and is acceptable to Him; not that He stands in need of a sacrifice from us, but that he who offers is himself glorified in what he does offer, if his gift be accepted (4:18:1).<sup>8</sup>

Inasmuch, then, as the Church offers with singlemindedness, her gift is justly reckoned a pure sacrifice with God... For it behoves



us to make an oblation to God, and in all things to be found grateful to God our Maker, in a pure mind, and in faith without hypocrisy, in well-grounded hope, in fervent love, offering the first-fruits of His own created things (4:18:4).<sup>9</sup>

Then, again, how can they say that the flesh, which is nourished with the body of the Lord and with His blood, goes to corruption, and does not partake of life? Let them, therefore, either alter their opinion, or cease from offering the things just mentioned. But our opinion is in accordance with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist in turn establishes our opinion. For we offer to Him His own, announcing consistently the fellowship and union of the flesh and Spirit. For as the bread, which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly; so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity (4:18:5).<sup>10</sup>

With regard to the first text, it is important to note that although the Eucharist is called a sacrifice, that sacrifice is not linked with the Sacrifice of Christ but with the words of Malachi concerning the offering of a 'pure sacrifice'.<sup>11</sup> This in spite of the fact that Irenaeus does refer to the death of Christ as a sacrifice.<sup>12</sup> Dix comments: "Unmistakably, Irenaeus regards the eucharist as an 'oblation' offered to God, but... Primarily it is for him a sacrifice of 'first-fruits', acknowledging the Creator's bounty in providing our earthly food, rather than as 're-calling' the sacrifice of Calvary in Pauline

fashion."<sup>13</sup> Dix also gives some emphasis to the majority opinion among scholars that the 'first-fruits' theme, prominent in the second quotation, is part of Irenaeus' anti-Gnostic teaching.<sup>14</sup>

The third text is anti-Gnostic polemic. The Christian view of the Eucharist is used to support Irenaeus' opposition to Gnostic anti-materialism. The strong emphasis on the Church's oblation of material things doubtless influenced the later doctrine of the Mass as an offering of the Sacrifice of Christ. We should note that both Roman Catholic scholars who think that Irenaeus taught transubstantiation and also Protestant scholars who wish to reduce his view of the Eucharist to an offering of praise and thanksgiving, have not given sufficient weight to Irenaeus' plain assertion that "the bread, which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly." This view of the 'Real Presence', for it must be considered at least that, is perhaps best described as what Aulen calls a "naive realism". As he points out, for the ancient writers "the metaphysical questions about the correlation of bread and wine with body and blood simply did not exist."<sup>15</sup>

In conclusion, it can be said that Irenaeus seems to fit into Dix's summary statement of eucharistic sacrifice in Early Tradition:

All we can say is that every one of these local traditions at the earliest point at which extant documents permit us to interrogate it, reveals the same general understanding of the eucharist as an 'oblation' (prosphora) or 'sacrifice' (thusia) -- something offered to God; and that the substance of the sacrifice is in every case in some sense the bread and cup.<sup>16</sup>

In Irenaeus' thought, the oblation rather than the sacrifice is the dominant note, and what is offered is definitely more than mere bread and wine. He unquestionably accepts and participates in the Liturgy, but as part of the Tradition as he has received it. It does not have the same significance for him that it was to have for St. Cyprian<sup>17</sup> in the third century or St. Augustine<sup>18</sup> a century later.

#### B.

#### The Reformation Deadlock

The Sacrifice of the Mass was a major item on the Reformers' agenda, as Article XXXI bears witness:

The offering of Christ once made is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore, the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

Bicknell points out that the Article was issued in approximately its present form a decade before the decrees of Trent on this subject.<sup>19</sup> It is therefore not directed at the official Roman teaching but is aimed at popular medieval ideas about the Mass. Bicknell summarizes the teaching of the article as follows:

1. The uniqueness and all-sufficiency of the sacrifice of the Cross
2. The falsity of any view that made each Mass a sacrifice independent of or additional to the sacrifice of the Cross.<sup>20</sup>

We have seen that the death of the victim in Old Testament sacrifice was the necessary prelude to the high point in the ritual, which was the manipulation of the blood. Our study of the New Testament has shown that, as Neville Clark says, the Sacrifice of Christ "is not the cross viewed in vacuo."<sup>21</sup> However, the Medieval world had only an imperfect understanding of these things. Sacrifice was thought of in terms of propitiation, something done to appease the wrath of God, and involving a change in the substance of the offering, as in the death of the animal in ancient sacrifice.<sup>22</sup> The result was the perverse idea that Christ is somehow put to death anew in each Mass and that the blessings accruing from each celebration could be multiplied by holding more and more Masses. It is

this popular view of worship during the Middle Ages that Article XXXI is condemning.

It is a real question as to whether any other, higher view of eucharistic sacrifice existed among the English Reformers. Cranmer, as Dugmore points out, resisted any and all ideas of the Eucharist being other than a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.<sup>23</sup> Fidelity to the teaching of the New Testament as they understood it, and particularly Hebrews, where the once-for-all death of Christ is contrasted with the repeated sacrifices of the Jewish system,<sup>24</sup> left the Reformers no other choice. Their concept of sacrifice as simply equivalent to death ruled out for them the possibility of its being a part of the Eucharist. Only a view of Christ's continuing ministry on the basis of the supreme moment on the Cross and in the same spirit as that ultimate self-offering in love and obedience, could have allowed them to see in the Eucharist a re-presenting of what was indeed done once-for-all, an opportunity for sinful man to have his offering of love and obedience taken up into a present and continuing Sacrifice.

The Roman Catholic theologians' problem was different. In order to be loyal to the teachings of the Fathers that the Eucharist is in some sense a sacrifice, they were forced into the position of having to explain how this could be, given the universal equation of sacrifice with death. The ultimate product of their attempt to find a solution to this problem is the ruling of the Council of Trent on the subject. It remains the official Roman Catholic position.

Forasmuch as, in this divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the mass, that same Christ is contained and offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the Cross; the holy synod teaches that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that by means thereof we obtain mercy, and find grace in seasonable aid... For the Lord, appeased by the offering thereof, and granting the grace and gift of repentance, forgives even heinous crimes and sins.<sup>25</sup>

*2ndly  
accurately?*

The definition is deliberately vague. No doubt the phrase 'truly propitiatory' is capable of a legitimate interpretation, but it is also capable of a meaning, which, as we have seen, is not faithful even to the best Old Testament thought about sacrifice.<sup>26</sup> The idea of an "unbloody oblation," though it perhaps acts as a safeguard against any gross view of a re-immolation of Christ in the Eucharist, is based ultimately on the same mistaken view that "connects the Eucharistic sacrifice, not with our Lord's Heavenly priesthood, but with

His death on the Cross placed in unreal isolation."<sup>27</sup>

This misunderstanding, shared by Protestant and Catholic alike at the time of the Reformation, has been commonly called the 'Reformation deadlock'. The clearest and best-known statement of the 'deadlock' is given by E.L. Mascall in his valuable little book,

Corpus Christi:

The Protestants were in effect repeatedly asserting 'Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; therefore the Eucharist cannot be a sacrifice, while the Catholics as constantly replied 'But the Eucharist is a sacrifice, therefore Christ must be in some sense put to death in it'; and neither side observed the suppressed major premiss which was common to both arguments, namely that sacrifice is simply equivalent to death. For Catholics therefore, the Eucharist was seen as a repetition of Calvary, while for Protestants it was at most a commemoration of Calvary.<sup>28</sup>

In a recently published study entitled Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation, Francis Clark, S.J. disputes this conclusion.<sup>29</sup> He summons a great deal of evidence to support his contention that the equation "sacrifice=death" really does not apply to the late-medieval period. However, a careful reading of his argument reveals the fact that he concentrates on the statement "For Catholics therefore, the Eucharist was seen as a repetition of Calvary." By so doing he is able to demonstrate that neither in its official instruction, nor to as great an extent as we had

commonly supposed, in popular preaching,<sup>30</sup> did the Roman Church teach or imply that the Eucharist is a 'repétition of Calvary'. However, he does not thereby undermine the cardinal point, which is that sacrifice in the medieval period was viewed as simply equivalent to death.

This is likely to remain the chief source of disagreement between Protestants and Roman Catholics on the matter, in spite of the growing understanding and approval of eucharistic sacrifice in the ecumenical movement. The official Roman formularies are based on an understanding of sacrifice as equivalent to death, and the Roman Catholic theologian must therefore find in the Eucharist some kind of immolation, or independent offering distinct from Calvary. The problem is increased if theologians like F. Clark continue to avoid the issue and even deny that it exists. Against Clark's inference that "sacrifice=death" is not faithful to his Church's teaching in any period, we may close with the following quotation from the celebrated Roman Catholic liturgist Joseph Jungmann:

This re-presentation is indeed some sort of offering (offerre), but is not properly a sacrificial offering (sacrifican), an immolation. Pre-Tridentine theology was not at all agitated over this distinction, the sacrificial character of the Mass being supplied by the oblatio



which took place in it. But the pressure of controversy seemed to demand a search for the precise sacrificial act within the Mass. And especially in view of the sacrifices of the Old Testament, it seemed necessary to acknowledge that a destruction of the gift was essentially required, so that, in the case of a living thing it had to be killed (destruction theory), just as Christ himself consummated His redemptive sacrifice by His death. The post-Tridentine Mass theories are concerned for the most part with demonstrating this "destructive" sacrificial activity in the Mass. However, no agreement over the solution has ever been reached.<sup>31</sup>

### C. The Eucharistic Sacrifice

There is a formula which offers a way out of the "deadlock" described in the last section. It is receiving wide support today, and it is in accord with the New Testament view of Eucharist and sacrifice presented in Chapter III.

This formula is not always stated in the same way, because there is no single author of it; but it always contains two elements: a definition of the Sacrifice of Christ which implies that the once-for-all event of Calvary is the basis for a continuing intercession of Christ on our behalf, and the belief that through His presence at the Eucharist our oblations are made one with His. It is a doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice based on the assertion that there is one Sacrifice, and that it is present whenever our Lord

is present because it is an indelible part of His divine being.

Both Protestant and Catholic theologians are beginning to adopt this general formula. Thus D.M. Baillie writes: "in the sacrament, Christ Himself being truly present, He unites us by faith with His eternal sacrifice, that we may plead and receive its benefits and offer ourselves in prayer and praise to God."<sup>32</sup> Neville Clark writes: "the Crucified Christ who gave himself at Calvary, is also the Ascended Christ who offers himself as High Priest in and with his members at the eucharist."<sup>33</sup> J.S. Whale writes: "just as he took his surrendered and outpoured life (which is our life for ever by our identification with him) through the Veil of his broken flesh into the holy presence of the Father, and atoned for us: so we come now, pleading that eternal sacrifice and participating in it with adoring gratitude... And because Christ-in-his-Church thus offers to the Father the Church-in-himself, 'we offer and present ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable holy and living sacrifice'."<sup>34</sup> These three writers each represent a different tradition within Protestantism. There are also Roman Catholic authors who endorse the same general formula. De la Taille, Vonier, and Masure reject any idea that the eucharistic sacrifice involves an 'immolation',

of Christ other than that offered once upon the Cross,<sup>35</sup> and Masure writes: "There are therefore in the Mass, if one may dare to put it so, two sacrifices... the Savior's sacrifice is substituted for her own, and is made one with it."<sup>36</sup> Aulen supplies this comment on the Roman Catholic Joseph Pascher's Eucharistia, Gestalt und Vollzug: "When we here speak of a 'renewal' of Christ's sacrifice on the cross, the meaning is not that what happened on the cross now is performed for the second or third time, but that the once-for-all sacrifice is made present again (vergegenwärtigt wird)... although Pascher speaks here about the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, he does not imply that his sacrifice was restricted to his death on the cross. The resurrection and ascension also belong to his sacrifice."<sup>37</sup>

The formula varies somewhat, to be sure, but the two chief elements are the same: the eternal Sacrifice of Christ and our participation in it by virtue of Christ's Real Presence in the Eucharist.<sup>38</sup> The first, as we have seen in Chapter III, has a legitimate base in the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the second, insofar as Christ's Presence and our union with Him is concerned, upon the Pauline doctrine of the Body. Together they describe the reality known to the Church as the eucharistic sacrifice.

Two points need to be underlined. This 'formula' as I have called it, does not obscure the important distinction to be made between the Cross and the continuing intercession of Christ on our behalf. The latter is only possible because of the utter completeness of the first. Thus Aulen writes:

Christ's intercessory sacrifice is continuous, while the sacrifice through which God reconciled the world to himself has been made once for all. The intercessory sacrifice rests on the foundation of the sacrifice of reconciliation. The intercessory sacrifice is <sup>not</sup> designed to create a new covenant, but to realize the covenant which has already been established.<sup>39</sup>

The second point is that the Sacrifice is present in the Eucharist simply because Christ himself is present. Without his real and objective presence in the consecrated bread and wine, the Eucharist would not be the Sacrifice. Anglican authors have done much to further the general formula we have been discussing,<sup>40</sup> and on this particular point the Anglican scholar E.L. Mascall has made a very clear statement:

The sacrificial character of the Mass does not consist in its being an event which happens to Christ after his Ascension and which in some way repeats or imitates his death, but in its being the means by which the whole sacrificial action of Christ, centered in the Cross and culminating in the Ascension, is made sacramentally present in his Church. It is not a repetition of the sacrifice; it is simply the sacrifice itself, present in the unique mode of a sacrament, present, that is, simply and solely because

the sacramental species are the divinely ordained effective signs of it.

...

And in the sacramental order the Mass contains and communicates the whole redemptive activity of Christ, the whole sweep of filial self-oblation that extends from his incarnation in the womb of Mary through his death on Calvary to his heavenly glorification. The Mass is therefore neither a new sacrifice, nor a part of the one Sacrifice; it is the one Sacrifice in its totality, present under a sign.<sup>41</sup>

If we ask how it is that Christ's sacramental presence conveys the one Sacrifice to us, the answer must surely be that what is present is the eternal sacrifice, now forever characterized by the supreme oblation at Calvary. We receive in the Holy Communion "the life whereof the abiding characteristic is to have died."<sup>42</sup>

Donald Baillie writes: "... the sins which we commit this very day are being borne and expiated by the eternal love of God."<sup>43</sup> Perhaps this points to the ultimate nature of the Sacrifice. As we have seen in Chapter III, Ramsey finds the Fourth Gospel's description of the eternal love between the Father and the Son the clue to an "eternal element of self-giving love in the Godhead."<sup>44</sup> These and many other questions present themselves for consideration. Is there an element of suffering in the eternal self-giving love in the Godhead?<sup>45</sup> What is the role of the Holy Spirit

in the eucharistic oblation?<sup>46</sup> It lies beyond the limits of this study to more than mention these. Our purpose here has been to set forth as clearly as possible the Biblical basis for the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice.

We began with an examination of the question as to why the doctrine did not emerge in New Testament times. This required an investigation of the institution of sacrifice in the Old Testament. Sacrifice was part of God's revelation of Himself to his people, and in the light of New Testament developments, it can be said to have a continuing significance for our understanding of the Christian Sacrifice.<sup>47</sup> The emphasis that it placed on obedience to the Law in the postexilic period may have prevented the New Testament authors from understanding the Eucharist as communion in Sacrifice, as a sharing in the divine self-offering, but it helped them to see in the work of Christ that perfect and final obedience that is the very basis of the eternal pleading of the Sacrifice of Christ. Similarly, the New Testament hope of an immediate second coming of Christ may have retarded the development of eucharistic theology, but it is certain that such vivid expectation belongs at the heart of our desire to offer ourselves to God in Him today.

The Lord's Supper interprets the coming death of Christ as a sacrifice. The Epistle to the Hebrews shows that His suffering began before the Cross and that His intercession on our behalf continues after it. St. Paul teaches that we are made one with Christ by receiving in faith his Body and Blood, and the Church teaches on the basis of this that we are one with His self-offering, that at the Eucharist our imperfect offering of love and obedience is perfected in Him.

To be sure, the Church does not hand down an undivided Tradition. A glance at the Early Church has told us that. Nor does it escape internecine warfare on the basis of mistaken presuppositions about the inheritance from the past. But it comes at length to a realization that the doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice rests securely upon the Gospel, strikes a note of response in the hearts of separated Christian brethren, and even in the stainless steel churches of the twentieth century, speaks to us of the eternal mystery of God.

## Notes for Chapter IV

<sup>1</sup>Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (London: Dacre Press, 1960), 115.

<sup>2</sup>Gnosticism is derived from the Greek word γνῶσις (knowledge), the supposedly revealed knowledge of God which as the basis for various esoteric systems of thought was produced from Scripture through allegorization by minds which found the Hellenistic (Greek ontological) world view more congenial than the Hebraic (eschatological). Having experienced no commitment to the reality of the earthly life of Jesus, especially of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, Christian Gnostics like Valentinus and Basilides, produced systems of teaching based upon Greek cosmological presuppositions with a slender admixture of Christian elements. (W. Walker, A History of the Christian Church [rev. ed., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959], 51-3.)

<sup>3</sup>Christianity entered the western Mediterranean world as a movement within the Greek commercial enclaves at important trading centers like Lyons.

<sup>4</sup>Irenaeus begins with the general Apologist view, based on Scripture, that man is a union of soul and body. He does not affirm a pure Greek soul from body redemption but rather the conferring of incorruption upon the body. In this he is opposing the Gnostics and their claim of re-absorption of the soul into the over-soul. Irenaeus views the work of God as that of overcoming for man those characteristics of life which make him created and giving him those characteristics of the Uncreated which will bring him from natural imperfection to supernatural perfection. Thus salvation is achieved by means of bringing man from ignorance to knowledge so that he can merit incorruptability. The key passage is 4:38:1f. in Adversus Haereses (The Ante-Nicene Fathers [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956], I, 521.)

In view of this, it is surprising that Seeberg called Irenaeus "the first great representative of Biblicism," that Beuzart stressed a predominance of Jewish-Christian elements in Irenaeus' thought, and that John Lawson in The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus sets out to "establish the primitive and Biblical character of the important ideas of S. Irenaeus." ([London: The Epworth Press, 1948], 18, 24.) One simply cannot read Irenaeus' writings on the basis of



the New Testament he read, because he skimmed off the top of the scriptures on the basis of the teachings of the Apologists. Neither can one speak of "The Theology of Saint Irenaeus as a Biblical System," (Lawson, op. cit., 113.) when in fact systematic thinking is not encountered among any of the Fathers until Origen in the 3rd century.

<sup>5</sup>W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos (Gottingen, 1913), 424.

<sup>6</sup>Infra, n. 14.

<sup>7</sup>"The heathen world was full of sacrifices. The Church could hardly have avoided explaining her worship in terms of sacrifice. The question still remains in what sense she employed them. Gradually the Church made clear to herself all that was implicit in the Eucharist from the first. She found in it at once the fulfillment and the correction of those imperfect ideas and aspirations that were embodied in Jewish and heathen sacrifices." (E.J. Bicknell, A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles [London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955], 411.)

<sup>8</sup>Adversus Haereses, op. cit., 484.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., 485.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., 486.

<sup>11</sup>Cf. Adversus Haereses 4:17:5 where Malachi 1:10, 11 is quoted.

<sup>12</sup>Adversus Haereses, 4:5:4.

<sup>13</sup>Dix, op. cit., 114.

<sup>14</sup>That is, an attack on Gnostic anti-materialism. For a cataloging of all the various opinions with regard to the origin of the "first-fruits" motif, and also a highly original interpretation which probably leans too heavily on Jewish-Christian elements in Irenaeus' thought, see D. Clark's The "First-Fruits" Motif in Irenaeus, an unpublished thesis on deposit at the library of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

<sup>15</sup>Gustaf Aulen, Eucharist and Sacrifice (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958), 39.

<sup>16</sup>Dix, op. cit., 112.

<sup>17</sup>"It is only with Cyprian in the next generation (C.A.D. 255) that the African doctrine is fully stated. For him, as for Tertullian, the matter of the sacrifice is the oblation brought by the people... But for Cyprian the whole question of how the eucharist is constituted a sacrifice is as clear-cut and completely settled as it is for a post-Tridentine theologian: 'Since we make mention of His passion in all our sacrifices, for the passion is the Lord's sacrifice which we offer, we ought to do nothing else than what He did (at the last supper).'" (Dix, op. cit., 115.)

<sup>18</sup>St. Augustine represents the developed Western view before the Medieval developments that were to greatly decrease the significance of the Mass for the individual worshipper. "But the actual possession of the happiness of this life, without the hope of what is beyond, is but a false happiness and profound misery." (The City of God, 19:20) Here we see the eschatological dimension in his thought. It meant that in the Eucharist one could gradually learn to "use this life with a reference to that other which he ardently loves and confidently hopes for." (19:20) Thus Augustine found great significance in the eucharistic oblation: "He is both the Priest who offers and the Sacrifice offered. And He designed that there should be a daily sign of this in the sacrifice of the Church, which, being His body, learns to offer herself through Him." (10:20)

<sup>19</sup>Bicknell, op. cit., 410.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., 410.

<sup>21</sup>Neville Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments (London: S.C.M., 1958), 64.

<sup>22</sup>"Not only did he (St. Thomas) define sacrifice as 'something done for the honour properly due to God in order to appease Him', but he asserted that it involved a change of some kind in the object offered, as 'that animals were killed, that bread is broken and eaten and blessed'... Aquinas was far too good a theologian to suppose that the sacrifice of Calvary was in any sense repeated or added to in the Eucharist, but his definition of sacrifice was the parent of theories that came dangerously near such teaching." (Bicknell, op. cit., 414-15.)

<sup>23</sup>C.W. Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformers (London: Macmillan and Co., 1958), 194. This was in contrast to Calvin's understanding that "The mediator interceding for us is Christ, by whom we offer ourselves and what is ours to the Father. He is our Pontiff, who has entered the heavenly sanctuary (Heb. 9:24) and opens a way for us to enter (cf. Heb. 10:20)." (Calvin, Institutes, Book IV, Chapter 28, 16, 17; Library of Christian Classics [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961], II, 1445.)

<sup>24</sup>Heb. 7:27; 9:14, 26-28; 10:10. Supra, p.s 38-9.

<sup>25</sup>Doctrine in the Church of England, 152.

<sup>26</sup>Supra, p.s 20-21.

<sup>27</sup>Bicknell, op. cit., 418.

<sup>28</sup>E.L. Mascall, Corpus Christi (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1957), 83.

<sup>29</sup>Francis Clark, S.J., Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1960), 380-409.

<sup>30</sup>In a very interesting chapter entitled "The Gross Popular Belief in a Daily Shedding of Christ's Blood at the Altar, attested by the Current Tales of Bleeding Hosts" Clark examines some of these tales and the comments of official Church teachers about them and concludes that what they actually reflect is "the constant and intense belief of Christians in the real substantial presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, a presence which the pious imagination of simple folk was prone to represent in too concrete a fashion." (Clark, op. cit., 410-34.)

<sup>31</sup>Joseph A. Jungmann, S.J., The Mass of the Roman Rite (Boston: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1959), 140.

<sup>32</sup>D.M. Baillie, The Theology of the Sacraments (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957), 117.

<sup>33</sup>N. Clark, op. cit., 65.

<sup>34</sup>J.S. Whale, Victor and Victim (Cambridge: The University Press, 1960), 59.

<sup>35</sup>Bicknell, op. cit., 418.

<sup>36</sup>Eugene Masure, The Christian Sacrifice (New York: P.J. Kenedy & Sons, 1943), 248.

<sup>37</sup>Aulen, op. cit., 54.

<sup>38</sup>The Romans insist on defining the presence of Christ in the Eucharist in terms of Transubstantiation. The New Testament writers did not think in terms of a metaphysical definition, and it is a matter of historical record that the Church did not approve such definition until the thirteenth century. It is therefore difficult to agree with Masure's insistence upon the decisive importance of Transubstantiation for a doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice (Masure, op. cit., 242.).

<sup>39</sup>Aulen, op. cit., 153. "Neither does the Church tell us anything different. She by no means obliges us to regard Christ's death on the Cross as a ritual sacrifice -- quite the contrary. This death is an historical fact, and as such, has no need to be -- nor could it be -- repeated." (E. Masure, The Sacrifice of the Mystical Body [London: Burns and Oates, 1954], 117-18.)

<sup>40</sup>The most influential Anglican author has been Dom Gregory Dix, and in particular his great study The Shape of the Liturgy. Dix writes: "For the patristic like the apostolic church, however, the twin realities of the church and the sacrament as Body of Christ were inseparably connected, and were regarded in a sense as cause and effect. They were integrated by the idea of the eucharist as our Lord's own action. We have seen what a great variety of interpretations of the single eucharistic action were already in circulation in the apostolic age, and these did not decrease in later times. One can, however, trace the gradual elaboration of a synthesis of all the main ideas about the eucharist into a single conception, whose key-thought is that the 'action' of the earthly church in the eucharist only manifests within time the eternal act of Christ as the heavenly High-priest at the altar before the throne of God, perpetually pleading His accomplished and effectual sacrifice." (Dix, op. cit., 251.)

Note also this well-balanced statement by the sub-committee on the Book of Common Prayer, submitted to the 1958 Lambeth Conference:

"This sacrifice is once and for all, but though it cannot be repeated, it is not merely a past fact; it is not only an event in history, but the revelation of eternal truth. He is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, now seated at the right hand of God after the power of an endless life. The fact revealed in time past has to be continually translated into the present by the operation of the Spirit. 'He will take what is mine and declare it to you' (John 16.14).

Christ's sacrificial work on the Cross was for us; he died as our Redeemer. He who once died and is now alive for ever more is also in us; he dwells in our hearts by faith. And in virtue of this union, we are now identified with him both in his death and passion, and in his resurrection life and glory. There is but one Body, of which he is the Head and we are the members; and we are made one with each other because we are one in him.

In our baptism we were united with him by the likeness of his death (Rom. 6.5) and in the Eucharist we abide in him as we eat his Body and drink his Blood (John 6.56). So we come to the Father in and through Jesus our great High Priest. We have nothing to offer that we have not first received, but we offer our praise and thanksgiving for Christ's sacrifice for us and so present it again, and ourselves in him, before the Father. We are partakers of the sacrifice of Christ (Heb. 13.15), and by our life of service and suffering for his sake in the world (Phil. 3.9,10). We ourselves, incorporate in the mystical body of Christ, are the sacrifice we offer. Christ with us offers us in himself to God." (The Lambeth Conference Report [London: S.P.C.K., 1958], part 2, 84.)

<sup>41</sup>Mascall, op. cit., 96-7. "We may legitimately inquire what part is played in the one Sacrifice by the various events of our Lord's incarnate life; how, for example, Calvary is constituted as a sacrificial reality, and is made something more than a legal execution, by the events of the Last Supper, and whether Calvary can be considered as a sacrifice apart from the Resurrection and the Ascension. But we cannot legitimately inquire what part is played in the sacrifice by the Mass, for the Mass is not part of the sacrifice; it just is the sacrifice -- sacramentally. Its efficacy consists not in its being an operation performed upon, or an action performed with, the crucified and glorified Body and Blood of Christ, but in the fact that, by divine ordinance, the Eucharistic species are the sacramental signs of the Body and Blood.

Nothing happens to Christ in the historical order as a result of the Eucharistic consecration. What happens in the historical order as a result of the Eucharistic consecration happens to the bread and wine; which, became, not by a change of physical properties but by sacramental causality, the Body and Blood of Christ, so that the one Sacrifice is made present in the Church as the ground of the Church's existence and the source of its life." (97-8)

<sup>42</sup>A.M. Ramsey, The Gospel and the Catholic Church [London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1956], 114.

<sup>43</sup>D. Baillie, op. cit., 117.

<sup>44</sup>Ramsey, op. cit., 114.

<sup>45</sup>See the discussion of this point in C.F.D. Moule, The Sacrifice of Christ [Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1957], 31-41. The triumph of biblical theology has not set aside the importance of metaphysical speculation. Temple's conclusion on suffering in the deity is likely to be of permanent interest: "The Greek conception of the impassibility of the Divine wrought fearful havoc in the theology of the patristic period. If Christ is the revelation of God, then God is not impassible. But to say baldly that He is passible is not true either. There is suffering in God, but it is always an element in the joy of the triumphant sacrifice." (William Temple, Christus Veritas [London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1954], 269.)

<sup>46</sup>Dix emphasizes the gift of the Spirit in connection with the eucharist, and cites a number of patristic texts (op. cit., 266-7.)

<sup>47</sup>According to The Catholic Encyclopedia, "It is a notable fact that the Divine institution of the Mass can be established, one might almost say, with greater certainty by means of the Old Testament than by means of the New." (Vol. x, 8.) There is an important element of truth in this statement, but it comes dangerously near to implying an identity between Old Testament ritual sacrifices and the Sacrifice of Christ. Thus the popular Roman Catholic tract "Why The Mass?" contains this statement: "Since the time of Christ, there are only two religions which have no real sacrifice, namely, Mohammedanism and Protestantism." (Dom Louis Traufler, O.S.B., "Why The Mass?" [Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1937], 5.) Basil Minchin

is nearer the truth when he writes: "The Old Testament sacrifices, including the ritual of the Day of Atonement, may be just play-acting beside the reality of Christ's action, but it was the play that taught us to understand the reality when it happened." (Basil Minchin, Covenant and Sacrifice [London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958], 20.)

The Old Testament sacrifices take on significance for us today when we look back on them from the standpoint of what God has done for us in Christ. Then it is that God's gracious love in providing for man a way of approach to Him can be seen to have had its imperfect beginnings (imperfect because of man's sin) long before the New Testament period. Moreover, the three chief elements in ancient sacrifice have all their counterparts in the Christian Sacrifice.

Through the common sacrificial meal of the old dispensation the union between the worshippers and their God was strengthened. In the Eucharist we offer our whole lives to God in Christ and receive back the divine Life in the Holy Communion. The culminating point of animal sacrifice was not the death of the victim, but the victim's death was necessary to the performance of the rite. Thus Calvary can be seen to stand not in isolation from the other events of Jesus' life but as the completion of that which began at Bethlehem and the beginning of an eternal ministry based upon an obedience in love that knew and conquered the death of the Cross.

The institution of sacrifice in the Old Testament is of abiding significance. I am convinced that one of the major reasons why this is not at once admitted by all groups of Christians is the irresponsible statements that are made by Roman Catholics, Anglicans, and some Protestants. One may add to the quotations from The Catholic Encyclopedia and a Roman tract these words of an Anglican scholar: "From at least as early as the Didache in the first half, and perhaps even the first quarter, of the second century, the Eucharist has been regarded as the Christian 'equivalent' of the sacrificial worship of Judaism and of the non-Jewish religions." (W. Norman Pittenger, The Christian Sacrifice [New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.], 99.) We may redress this grievance with a final quotation from another Anglican author: "So different is this priesthood from all Jewish and pagan priesthood that there is an inevitable tendency to avoid the application of priestly language to the Christian ministry or to the Christian rites lest the associations of Judaism or paganism might be present." (Ramsey, op. cit., 115.)

## Bibliography

- W.F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957).
- Bernard W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957).
- Augustine, The City of God (New York: The Modern Library, 1950).
- Gustaf Aulen, Eucharist and Sacrifice (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958).
- D.M. Baillie, The Theology of the Sacraments (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957).
- Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Cairo Fragments of a Damascene Covenant," Harvard Theological Review, XLVI (July, 1953).
- F.W. Beare, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959).
- J.A. Bewer, The Literature of the Old Testament (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957).
- E.J. Bicknell, A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955).
- W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos (Gottingen, 1913).
- John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959).
- Yngve Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice (London: S.P.C.K., 1953).
- Millar Burrows, An Outline of Biblical Theology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956).
- John Calvin, Institutes, Book IV, Chapter 28, Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961).
- F.L. Cirlot, The Early Eucharist (London:, 1939).



- Francis Clark, S.J., Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1960).
- Neville Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1958).
- John O. Cobham, "The Sacrifice of the New Covenant", The Parish Communion (London: S.P.C.K., 1954).
- S.I. Curtiss, Primitive Semitic Religion Today (Chicago: F.H. Revell Co., 1902).
- A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904).
- W.B. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: SPCK, 1948).
- Canon L. Dewar, "The Biblical Use of the Term 'Blood'," The Journal of Theological Studies, IV (October, 1953).
- Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (London: Dacre Press, 1960).
- C.W. Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformers (London: Macmillan and Co., 1958).
- Austin W. Farrer, "Eucharist and Church in the New Testament," The Parish Communion (London: S.P.C.K., 1954).
- S.C. Gayford, Sacrifice and Priesthood (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1953).
- A.R. George, Communion with God in the N.T. (London: Epworth Press, 1953).
- Cyrus H. Gordon, The World of the Old Testament (Garden City: Doubleday Company, Inc., 1958).
- Norman K. Gottwald, A Light to the Nations (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959).
- H.L. Goudge, "Sacrifice in the Old Testament," Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, Subject: The Holy Eucharist, London, July, 1927 (Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1927).
- Frederick C. Grant, Ancient Judaism and the New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1959).

Buchanan Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament (London: Oxford, 1925).

H.H. Guthrie, Jr., God and History in the Old Testament (Greenwich, Conn., The Seabury Press, 1960).

A.G. Hebert, "Atone," A Theological Word Book of the Bible (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1959).

. . . The Authority of the Old Testament (London: Faber and Faber, 1947).

F.C.N. Hicks, The Fullness of Sacrifice (London: S.P.C.K., 1946).

A.J.B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament (London: S.C.M., 1956).

A.H. Hunter, "Recent Trends in Johannine Studies," The Expository Times, LXXI (April, 1960).

Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, The Ante-Nicene Fathers (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956), I.

Edmond Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958).

E.O. James, Origins of Sacrifice (London: John Murray, 1933).

"Sacrifice: Introductory and Primitive,"  
Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, XI.

Joachim Jeremias, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960).

The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955).

F.B. Jevons, An Introduction to the History of Religions (London: Methuen & Co., 1896).

Sherman E. Johnson, A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960).

Joseph A. Jungmann, S.J. The Mass of the Roman Rite (Boston: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1959).

E.L. Kendall, A Living Sacrifice (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960).

John Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950).

Criticism and Faith (New York: Abingdon, 1952).

The Death of Christ (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958).

Ernest Benjamin Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954).

John Lawson, The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus (London: The Epworth Press, 1948).

Walter Lowrie, Action in the Liturgy (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953).

William Manson, Jesus the Messiah (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1952).

The Epistle to the Hebrews (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951).

E.L. Mascall, Corpus Christi (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1957).

Eugene Masure, The Christian Sacrifice (New York: P.J. Kenedy & Sons, 1943).

The Sacrifice of the Mystical Body (London: Burns & Oates, 1954).

F.D. Maurice, The Doctrine of Sacrifice (London: Macmillan and Co., 1879).

Basil Minchin, Covenant and Sacrifice (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958).

G.F. Moore, Judaism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927).

"Sacrifice", Encyclopaedia Biblica, IV.

Leon Morris, The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956).

"The Biblical Use of the Term 'Blood'," The Journal of Theological Studies, III (October, 1952).

- C.F.D. Moule, The Sacrifice of Christ (Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1957).
- W.O.E. Oesterley, Sacrifices in Ancient Israel (New York: The Macmillan Co., \_\_\_\_).
- J.P.E. Pedersen, Israel, III-IV: Its Life and Culture (London: Oxford University Press, 1940).
- W. Norman Pittinger, The Christian Sacrifice (New York: Oxford University Press, 1951).
- O. Quick, The Gospel of the New World (London: Nisbet, 1944).
- Arthur Michael Ramsey, F.D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology (Cambridge: The University Press, 1951).
- The Gospel and the Catholic Church (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1956).
- A.E.J. Rawlinson, "Corpus Christi," Bell and Deissman (Ed.s), Mysterium Christi, Christological Studies by British and German Theologians (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930).
- John A.T. Robinson, The Body, 'A Study in Pauline Theology' (Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, 1955).
- H. Wheeler Robinson, "Hebrew Sacrifice and Prophetic Symbolism," Journal of Theological Studies XLIII.
- Redemption and Revelation (London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1942).
- H.H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," in Bulletin of the John Rylands Library XXXIII (September, 1950).
- The Unity of the Bible (London: The Carey Kingsgate Press Ltd., 1953).
- W.J. Sparrow Simpson, The Religion of Sacrifice (London: S.P.C.K., 1947).
- W. Robertson Smith, Lectures on the religion of the Semites: the Fundamental Institutions (ed. by S.A. Cook; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927).

James S. Stewart, A Man in Christ (New York: Harper and Brothers, \_\_\_\_).

Darwell Stone, History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909).

F.J. Taylor, "The Will of God in the Epistle to the Hebrews," The Expository Times, LXXII (March, 1961).

Vincent Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1955).

The Atonement in New Testament Teaching (London: The Epworth Press, 1954).

The Names of Jesus (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1954).

William Temple, Christus Veritas (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1954).

L.S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1946).

H. Clay Trumbull, The Blood Covenant (Philadelphia: John D. Wattles, 1893).

E.B. Tylor, Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom (Boston: Estes & Lauriat, 1874).

R.K. Yerkes, Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952).

Th C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958).

Oudtestamentische Studien, VII ("The Term Hizza: Lustration and Consecration" 1950).

W. Walker, A History of the Christian Church (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959).

Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel (New York: Meridian Books, 1958).

J.S. Whale, Victor and Victim (Cambridge: The University Press, 1960).

W.J. Wolf, No Cross, No Crown (Garden City: N.Y.:  
Doubleday Co., 1957).

Ernest Wright, The Rule of God, Essays in Biblical  
Theology (New York: Doubleday and Co.,  
1960).

The Catholic Encyclopedia.

Doctrine in the Church of England.

Encyclopedia Britannica (9th ed.).

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.

Interpreter's Bible.

The Lambeth Conference Report (1958).

### Note

The following two pages contain a critique by Prof. C.W.F. Smith, one of the two faculty readers of the foregoing dissertation. I have included it here because I believe that anyone sufficiently interested in the subject of eucharistic sacrifice (and patient enough!) to read my thesis will benefit, as I have, from his evaluation of it.

Such a useful list of notes and criticisms, coming out of what has been for Dr. Smith an unusually busy year-end schedule, is indicative of a real Christian love and concern for which I here want to record my gratitude.

The Holy Sacrifice, F.A. Fenton.

This is a fine job showing wide reading, ability to follow up clues, skill at sorting and assessment and a willingness to be led by the evidence. The construction and conclusions are sound, the Bibliography well handled and the evidence clearly embodied. Design and scope brought under control.

Some detailed notes -

- The isolation of the problem in the first pages is well done.  
Note p 9. where footnote enumeration skips 11 see p 48.  
Notes 26-27 - does this give too little weight to critical studies, too much to archaeological; the truth somewhere more between?
- p. 14. Should it be noted here, applying to perhaps an earlier period ('reflected say in Gen 22), that God Himself provides the sacrifice? cf. p. 21 quotation from Wright.
- N. 35 - is this a little overstated?
- N. 37 cf pp. 19-20, 27, 71. Should it have been noted that in certain circles, e.g. during the Babylonian Exile, among the DS Covenanters and in times when the Priesthood was corrupt, there was a growing tendency to see that "the fruit ('bulls' in Hos.14.2) of our lips" was a means of offering -- the expression crops up in the Dead Sea Hodayoth and lies behind Paul's "rational worship" -- and this is related to the cultus through the institution of the ma'amad whereby those who could not go to the temple gathered to rehearse the Torah in the home village (probably the origin of the synagogue). In the thesis this would have reinforced what is said of the Torah.
- p. 18 and N. 40 - perhaps a little more emphasis on the role of the king as priest and the temple as royal chapel?
- p. 22 N. 54. Does the idea of "representation" rather than substitution as such play a part e.g., is the laying on of hands really transfer or designation of a representative? note "identified" on same page.
- p. 24. Isn't the key word in the Moule quotation "finally", and one which you later pick up? I don't have the context but CFD probably does not doubt they were temporarily and for the occasion efficacious.
- p. 41. Good sentence about Corinth, but would not at least the reference have come up in connection with the subject of foods, the table of demons and the table of the Lord, I Cor. 10:14ff.?
- pp 41-2. Should not a sort of "platonic" world-view also be ascribed to Hebs?
- N. 114. Is Eucharist totally lacking in Rev.? see M.H. Shepherd: The Psachal Liturgy and the Apocalypse. Add to Biblio?
- N. 12 (p.87) A good note on a difficult problem. Re the Fourth Gospel, does this miss the point that the Evangelist has also moved the Anointing to a non-Synoptic date to conform to the date of the crucifixion (see McArthur: The Evolution of the Christian Year.)
- N. 13. There is perhaps an "enigmatic" use which I would say comes nearer covering the evidence especially since the Enoch Similitudes are conspicuously absent from the Dead Sea library. On the Servant reference should be made to Morna D. Hooker: Jesus and the Servant, - add to Biblio?



- N.19 "new" is certainly in this context eschatological.
- p. 72. For Luke the eschat. ref. comes also at the beginning.
- N. 23. cf. Leitzmann: Messe und Herrenmahl.
- p. 73ff. Does the use of Blood do more than inaugurate the Covenant?  
cf. p. 72. Is it necessary for continuance of Cov?
- N. 26 What is meant by "repeated...as actual realities...through the Eucharist"?
- p. 74. Is the eternal truth of the same order or nature as the event in time? In what follows I do not find it clearly established from Hebrews that Christ offers a constant oblation but only that, sitting at the Right Hand, he makes constant intercession. What would a constant pleading of His sacrifice by Christ infer as to the nature of God? What is established is the sense of eternal sacrifice in the sense of eternal Son-obedience inherent in the filial relationship. I take it this is meant by pp. 74-76. "The death is at any rate the moment of revelation of this eternal character of sonship, p.76..p. 77. Hebs, seems to say that the continued intercession is effective because it is undertaken by the One who made (rather than "makes") the sacrifice. Most of what Hebs. says about Xt as H. Priest seems to refer to his Act in history (death and entry to heaven). p. 78 is a good statement, but is "reconciliation-oblation" an addition to "intercession" which is not explicit in the NT? p. 79 Crux is what does "now to appear" mean? p. 80. Dr. Wolf goes on to say, "This permits him to stress both completion and abrogation...". The sentence (p.80) beginning, "The sacrifice of the Cross..." is a fine statement of the situation. (cf. p. 85 "as taught by..")
- N.52. I wonder? Perhaps the reference here is to the altar as a place of communion-sacrifice and means that the Table is limited to Christians?
- p. 83. This discussion perhaps need to be modified a little by adding to JATR a reading of E. Best and P. Minear (Images of the Ch. in the NT). I can't help feeling that the Body is used more nearly as a metaphor than as an ontological theory. As a metaphor it is solidly organic and taken with full seriousness but it does not stand alone (Minear's point). Should we say "based upon the Euch. bread" or "finds itself realized (or does not, in some cases) in the Bread". Cf. p. 97 Davies' use of the word "symbolic". (Shouldn't you have W.D. Davies not W.B.?)
- p. 84 Especially good.
- p. 85. Last sentence, fine.
- p. 107 N 25. There is less vagueness if you quote the "anathemas".
- p. 110 Opening sentence of last para. very clearly put.
- p. 113 Fine page, but in the Aulen quotation is "not" missing?  
What does he mean by "intercessory sacrifice"?
- N.40 On Dix' "perpetual pleading" see above on Doctrine of God implied.
- N. 45 Would it have helped here to note Wolf's fine discussion in pp. 196ff of NCNC.?
- p. 127 N.47. It is interesting that there is a parallel in that the death of the animal was prior, then the application of the blood; the Passover lamb was killed previously, then the meal eaten; Christ died once, and ever since the Oblation is offered and the Meal eaten.

The last page is fine and especially the last sentence!  
Good work.

*C. S. J.*